



## Level 1 Validation Certificate

This document verifies that the Level 1 Validation process was completed. The session details and audit review outcomes are included here.

*This certificate is required for submission – alongside the Level 1 validated water audit software file – to the California Department of Water Resources.*

Call Date: 8/14/2020

### Water Supplier

---

Supplier Name: City of Sacramento

Supplier Participants: Charley Cunningham, Utilities Operations and Maintenance Superintendent

Roshini Das, Program Manager, Sustainability

Brett Ewart, Senior Engineer

Julie Friedman, Program Specialist, Environmental Services Manager

Richard Glenn, Utilities Operation and Maintenance Supervisor

William Granger, Program Specialist, Water Conservation Administrator

Eric Halverson, Senior Department System Specialist

Diane Naranjo, Administrative Analyst

Kathy Sananikone, Assistant Civil Engineer

Craig Stevens, Utilities Operation and Maintenance Supervisor

#### *Additional Audit Contributions:*

Don A. Conner, Instrument Technician II

Jon Conover, Utilities Operations and Maintenance Superintendent

Nick Liu, IT Department Systems Specialist 1

Ray Wilderman, Information Technology Supervisor

### Validator

---

Validator: Kate Gasner,  
Water Systems Optimization

Validator Qualifications: Water Audit Validator Certificate from  
the AWWA California Nevada Section

### Key Audit Metrics

Data Validity Score:	66	
ILI:	5.1	
Real Loss:	49.8	gal / conn / day
Apparent Loss:	12.6	gal / conn / day
Non-Revenue Water as Percent of Cost of Operating System:	2.0%	

Note that these performance indicators – in City of Sacramento’s case – are influenced by the uncertainty of the unmetered portion of their customer population.

### Certification Statement by Validator

This water loss audit report has been Level 1 validated per the requirements of California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 7 and the California Water Code Section 10608.34.

All recommendations on volume derivation and Data Validity Grades were incorporated into the water audit. ☒

## Level 1 Validation – Water Supplier Confirmation

This document confirms participation in and endorsement of the Level 1 Validation as completed.

*This acknowledgement is required for submission – alongside your Level 1 validated water audit software file – to the California Department of Water Resources.*

Water Supplier Name: City of Sacramento Department of Utilities

---

Water Supplier Public Water System ID: 3410020

---

Water Audit Period: Fiscal Year 2020 (07/01/2019 – 06/30/2020)

---

### Water Audit & Water Loss Improvement Steps

*Steps taken in the audit period timeframe to increase data source accuracy, reduce real losses, and/or reduce apparent losses, as informed by the water audit.*

- Accelerated water meter installation program (by 2020-2021)
- Increased technical advisory review with expanded Water Loss Committee members throughout Utility
- Participated in stakeholder meetings (SWRCB and DWR), industry/professional organizations, committees (AWWA, WTA) to share information
- Improved understanding of Supply Meter Master Meter Error. Changed calibration record-keeping to coincide with fiscal year audit period
- Established ongoing mechanisms for customer meter accuracy testing, active leakage control and infrastructure monitoring
- Improved data reliability and evaluated cost-effective interventions for water and revenue loss recovery
- Determined “Unbilled Metered” volumes at Water Treatment Plants
- Provided for ongoing detailed data analytics and performance management
- Provided field validation of annual system wide audit results on a sample portion of the system increasing stakeholder confidence in audit report via Pilot DMA Program Phase 2
- Began economic business case planning for long-term needs based upon improved data becoming available through the audit process

### Certification Statement by Water Supplier Executive:

This water loss audit report meets the requirements of California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 7 and the California Water Code Section 10608.34 and has been prepared in accordance with the method adopted by the American Water Works Association, as contained in their manual, *Water Audits and Loss Control Programs, Manual M36, Fourth Edition* and in the Free Water Audit Software version 5.

Executive Name (print):	William O. Busath
Executive Position:	Director
Signature:	<u>William Busath</u> William Busath (Sep 4, 2020 12:03 PDT)
Date	09/03/2020



## Level 1 Validation Summary Notes

This document includes detailed notes about utility practices as reviewed during third-party level-one water audit validation.

This document is not a required submission to the California Department of Water Resources. It is meant to provide background and documentation of the validation process.

### Call Information

Utility	Validator
Utility Name: City of Sacramento	Validator: Kate Gasner, Water Systems Optimization
Utility Participants: Charley Cunningham, Utilities Operations and Maintenance Superintendent Roshini Das, Program Manager, Sustainability Brett Ewart, Senior Engineer Julie Friedman, Program Specialist, Environmental Services Manager Richard Glenn, Utilities Operation and Maintenance Supervisor William Granger, Program Specialist, Water Conservation Administrator Eric Halverson, Senior Department System Specialist	Validator Qualifications: Water Audit Validator Certificate from the AWWA California Nevada Section  Call Date: 8/14/2020
Diane Naranjo, Administrative Analyst Kathy Sananikone, Assistant Civil Engineer Craig Stevens, Utilities Operation and Maintenance Supervisor	
<i>Additional Audit Contributions:</i>	
Don A. Conner, Instrument Technician II Jon Conover, Utilities Operations and Maintenance Superintendent Nick Liu, IT Department Systems Specialist 1 Ray Wilderman, Information Technology Supervisor	

## Validation Call Notes

Audit Input	Grade	Audit Input Notes	Data Validity Grade Notes
Volume from Own Sources	5	<p><b>Source Meter Profile:</b> Includes two surface water treatment plants and groundwater wells (x32).</p> <p><i>For Treatment Plant Volumes:</i></p> <p>Influent to WTP is used rather than effluent because staff is suspicious of effluent meter accuracy (more water measured at finished water meters than at inlets). Given the complications of bi-directional effluent flow meters and recirculation to the treatment plants for backwash, influent meters were used as the data source here. Each water treatment plant has two active mag meters measuring influent flow.</p> <p>SCADA transfers data minutely data, but hourly logs are also filed by plant operators. Data is documented in the daily reports, rolled up into the total. Small precision lost in hourly summaries, but this data source is the most consistent and subject to quality control by operators.</p> <p>Note for future consideration: there is a meter at the Fairbairn WTP that could be examined to better quantify distinction between influent and effluent.</p> <p><i>For well production volumes:</i></p> <p>Each well meter has a mag meter installed.</p> <p>Each site is visited every other day (thereabout) – mainly for on-site treatment inspection. Raw data collected via SCADA continuously and is pulled into summary reporting on a monthly basis.</p> <p>9 wells not running throughout the year.</p> <p><b>Derivation:</b> SCADA reads from production meters as archived.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Input derivation from supporting documents confirmed. Exclusion of non-potable volumes confirmed.</p>	<p><b>Approximate Percent of Volume Metered:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Approximate Percent Tested and/or Calibrated:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Calibration Frequency:</b> Annual.</p> <p><b>Volumetric Testing Frequency:</b> Occasional effort but no regular activity.</p> <p><b>Volumetric Testing Method:</b> n/a.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Sacramento has a policy that every mag meter is “verified” once per year (involving a site visit, execution of an internal calibration protocol, and inspection of instrumentation)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Verification process is inherent to the mag meter technology, Endress &amp; Hauser’s “Heartbeat Verification”</li> <li>• Treatment plant meters show documentation with simulated flows and output signal comparisons; the newer well meters have documentation that summarizes a “Pass” status, but does not specify any deviation</li> </ul> <p>At a DVG of 6 or higher, the calibration or test’s outcomes must be quantified and the documentation must show specific calibration results. Without such specificity on the well meter calibration documents, a DVG of a 5 is assigned.</p>

Volume from Own Sources Master Meter and Supply Error Adjustment	5	<p><b>Derivation:</b> Left blank in absence of available test data.</p> <p><b>Change in Storage Considered:</b> Not applicable, though monitored via SCADA (~45 MG in capacity).</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>Source Meter Read Method:</b> Automatic logging via SCADA telemetry.</p> <p><b>Source Meter Read Frequency:</b> System currently pulling data hourly, operator reviews and documents hourly totals for later aggregation.</p> <p><b>Data Review Practices:</b> Data reviewed by plant operators – officially document hourly data for WTP.</p> <p>For treatment plants, mag meter data transferred via SCADA (on a minute or two minute basis). Operators constantly consulting this data for the treatment plant, logging and QAQC conducted on hourly values.</p> <p>For well production data, each site is visited every other day (thereabout) – mainly for on-site treatment inspection. Raw data collected via SCADA continuously and is pulled into summary reporting on a monthly basis.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Storage is managed such that tanks turn over constantly, used to supplement production from the treatment plant. As such, change in storage from beginning to end of the year would be negligible and was not calculated nor included.</p> <p>Limiting factor on DVG is the monthly review of well production.</p>
Water Imported	n/a	<p><b>Import Meter Profile:</b> Sacramento imports water through SCWA &amp; Sacramento Suburban Water District (1 meter each). Neither were active in FY19-20.</p> <p><b>Derivation:</b> When active, totalization of volumes per invoices received from exporter.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> n/a.</p>	<p><b>Approximate Percent of Volume Metered:</b> 100%, when active.</p> <p><b>Approximate Percent Tested and/or Calibrated:</b> 100%, when active.</p> <p><b>Calibration Frequency:</b> Annual.</p> <p><b>Volumetric Testing Frequency:</b> None.</p> <p><b>Volumetric Testing Method:</b> n/a.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>

Water Imported Master Meter and Supply Error Adjustment	n/a	<p><b>Derivation:</b> Left blank in absence of available test data.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>Import Meter Read Method:</b> Automatic logging via SCADA telemetry.</p> <p><b>Import Meter Read Frequency:</b> Hourly.</p> <p><b>Data Review Practices:</b> Each business day.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>
Water Exported	5	<p><b>Export Meter Profile:</b> Mag meters at each intertie: 7 connections exist; 5 were active in FY19-20.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Input derivation from supporting documents confirmed. Exclusion of non-potable volumes confirmed. Exclusion from BMAC input confirmed.</p>	<p><b>Approximate Percent of Volume Metered:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Approximate Percent Tested and/or Calibrated:</b> 100%</p> <p><b>Calibration Frequency:</b> Annual.</p> <p><b>Volumetric Testing Frequency:</b> None.</p> <p><b>Volumetric Testing Method:</b> n/a.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> See discussion of detail in calibration documentation above (under Volume from Own Sources). Similar limiting factor is applied here.</p>
Water Exported Master Meter and Supply Error Adjustment	5	<p><b>Derivation:</b> Left blank in absence of available test data.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>Export Meter Read Method:</b> Automatic logging via SCADA telemetry.</p> <p><b>Export Meter Read Frequency:</b> Monthly for billing, but possible to interrogate at least daily. Plant operators have access to this data.</p> <p>Raw data collected via SCADA continuously and is pulled into summary reporting, during which time QAQC is conducted, on a monthly basis.</p> <p><b>Data Review Practices:</b> Continuous flow quality checks via SCADA, monthly queries of data from totalizer.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>



Billed Metered Authorized Consumption	7	<p><b>Derivation:</b> Extract from billing database at the end of the audit period.</p> <p><b>Customer Meter Profile</b></p> <p><b>Read Frequency:</b> Monthly pulls for billing. Hourly data is available. Each day, meter reads fetched from vendor. Billing data table extracts one datapoint each month.</p> <p><b>Reading Technology:</b> AMI (99.5% mechanical meters)</p> <p>Any unsuccessful data transfers supplemented by drive-by reads and/or manual reads.</p> <p><b>Age Profile:</b> Varies based on size-based replacement cycle: oldest meters are 20 years old</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Lag-time correction is not employed in input derivation. Input derivation from supporting documents confirmed. Exclusion of non-potable volumes confirmed.</p> <p>Meter reading group convenes once a month to discuss meter reading related issues (endpoint functionality, data transfers, etc).</p> <p>AMI enabling customer-side leakage awareness and repair: in FY19-20 alone, over 15K follow ups with customers were recorded regarding leakage alerts.</p>	<p><b>Approximate Percent Metered:</b> 96% metered as of June 2020 (the audit period started at ~92% metered).</p> <p>For each billing cycle, meter reader teams are still active. These teams supplement the AMI system with manual reads for any accounts don't come through on AMI.</p> <p><b>Small Meter Testing Practices:</b> Three areas of small meter testing occurs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10% of new meter stock is tested before install</li> <li>• Every meter that is replaced (age-based)</li> <li>• Handful of customer complaints</li> </ul> <p><b>Number of Small Meters Tested:</b> 1,278 small meters tested (2" and smaller)</p> <p><b>Large Meter Testing Practices:</b> Same testing policy as small meters.</p> <p><b>Number of Large Meters Tested:</b> 105 large meters tested bench tested (majority of which are tested under the age-based replacement policy). Re-installed if pulled for customer complaints and meets all standards. Some large meters are prompted from AMI consumption reports.</p> <p><b>General Replacement Practices:</b> Based on an age: every 10 years for 1.5" and larger, every 20 years for 1" and smaller</p> <p><b>Billing Data Review:</b> Standard billing QC, plus review of volumes by use type each billing cycle. Specific accounts reviewed if customer complaint is filed.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>
Billed Unmetered Authorized Consumption	7	<p><b>Profile:</b> Conversion to metering project underway.</p> <p><b>Derivation:</b> Extrapolation from like use data on metered connections. Anomalous accounts extracted from the base data used to estimate unmetered.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>Policy for Metering Exemptions:</b> Migration to fully metered status is currently under way.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Worksheet on extrapolation calculations provided; complicated by rapidly changing landscape with much metering deployment.</p>

Unbilled Metered Authorized Consumption	9	<p><b>Profile:</b> Volume registered at treatment plant influent meters for the purposes of maintenance work during periods when the treatment is not producing into distribution (winter months).</p> <p><b>Derivation:</b> Influent meter reads.</p>	<b>Policy for Billing Exemptions:</b> Limited to own facilities.
Unbilled Unmetered Authorized Consumption	5	<p><b>Profile:</b> Operational flushing and fire department usage.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<b>Comments:</b> Default grade applied.
Unauthorized Consumption	n/a	<b>Comments:</b> Default input applied.	<b>Comments:</b> Default grade applied.
Customer Metering Inaccuracies	5	<p><b>Derivation:</b> Inferred from reference data (anecdotal test results) but not derived from test data analysis &amp; calculation.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p> <p>*See BMAC comments regarding meter testing &amp; replacement activities.</p>	<p><b>Customer Meter Testing:</b> Routine (proactive), but not fully representative.</p> <p><b>Customer Meter Replacement:</b> Routine (proactive), but limited.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>
Systematic Data Handling Errors	5	<b>Comments:</b> Default input applied.	<b>Comments:</b> Default grade applied.
Length of Mains	9	<p><b>Derivation:</b> Totaled from GIS based map.</p> <p><b>Hydrant Laterals Included:</b> Yes.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>Map Format:</b> Digital.</p> <p><b>Asset Management Systems:</b> GIS system communicates with CMMS system and documents asset characteristics, updates; new tool under development to do more forward-looking asset management work.</p> <p><b>Map Update Process:</b> Accomplished through normal work order processes, water meter replacements, and new main installations.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>

Number of Service Connections	9	<p><b>Derivation:</b> Standard report run from billing system, as reviewed and vetted for the DDW report (mid-point of the year).</p> <p><b>Basis for Query:</b> Based on “service agreement” count; best estimate of service connections. Improving upon metering install verifications. 118 service points without service agreements are considered the inactive total.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>Field Validation:</b> Periodic field checks upon meter replacement or need for supplemental manual read.</p> <p><b>Estimate of Error:</b> 1%.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> GIS data actively beginning to populate for service connections, but not all meters captured.</p>
Average Operating Pressure	7	<p><b>How Pressure is Maintained:</b> 1 pressure zone for most of the system (a very small additional pressure zone, isolated and booster pumped)</p> <p><b>Pressure Range:</b> 30PSI – 70PSI (very highest); 45 to 50 is typical.</p> <p><b>Derivation:</b> Output from hydraulic model.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Hydraulic model.</p>	<p><b>Pressure Data Collection:</b> Hydrant pressures taken during routine system flushing and/or hydrant testing. New businesses are required to do a pressure test as well.</p> <p><b>Real-Time Monitoring:</b> Well-covered - telemetry or pressure logging beyond the boundary points (every supply point), targeted in some portions of the system but not representative of the whole (other city facilities). ~80 points of pressure sensors data collected.</p> <p><b>Hydraulic Model:</b> One exists but has not been fully calibrated within the last 5 years (2013); however pressure data pulled and compared for spot checking.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Quite flat system, flat hydraulic grade line minimizes change in pressure. Updating and calibrating model currently – new query will be available for next year.</p>
Annual Operating Cost	10	<p><b>Derivation:</b> From official financial reports.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Confirmed costs limited to water only, and water debt service included.</p>	<p><b>Auditing Practices:</b> Annually by a third party CPA.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>
Customer Retail Unit Cost	10	<p><b>Rate Structure:</b> Simple flat rate</p> <p><b>Derivation:</b> Simple rate structure with only a single volumetric rate. Sewer charges are not based on water meter readings (except for a handful of commercial accounts that have sewer charges based on meter reading). Sewer revenues are not incorporated into calculation.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>M36 Review:</b> Input calculations have been reviewed by an M36 water loss expert.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>

---

Variable Production Cost	7	<p><b>Primary Costs:</b> Own sources and import supply.</p> <p><b>Secondary Costs:</b> Solids handling, filter backwash costs, etc.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> No additional comments.</p>	<p><b>M36 Review:</b> Primary costs plus some but not all applicable secondary costs. Input calculations have been reviewed and calculated with a third-party consultant.</p> <p><b>Comments:</b> Chemicals, electricity and solids handling + incidental components that wear out quickly included.</p>
--------------------------	---	---	--

Infrastructure & Water Loss Management Practices:

**Infrastructure age profile:** Varied, some areas very old.

**Infrastructure replacement policy (current, historic):** CIP based on condition assessment. 10.5 miles replaced in FY19-20.

**Estimated main failures/year:** 129 mains failures in FY19-20.      **Estimated service failures/year:** 255 service failures in FY19-20.

**Extent of proactive leakage management:** DMA projects underway but on pause until metering fully installed; proactive leak detection ongoing with 1 crew active.

**Other water loss management comments:** No additional comments.

# AWWA Free Water Audit Software v5.0

American Water Works Association Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

This spreadsheet-based water audit tool is designed to help quantify and track water losses associated with water distribution systems and identify areas for improved efficiency and cost recovery. It provides a "top-down" summary water audit format, and is not meant to take the place of a full-scale, comprehensive water audit format.

Auditors are strongly encouraged to refer to the most current edition of AWWA M36 Manual for Water Audits for detailed guidance on the water auditing process and targetting loss reduction levels

The spreadsheet contains several separate worksheets. Sheets can be accessed using the tabs towards the bottom of the screen, or by clicking the buttons below.

## Please begin by providing the following information

Name of Contact Person:	Julie Friedman	
Email Address:	jfriedman@cityofsacramento.org	
Telephone (incl Ext.):	916-808-7898	
Name of City / Utility:	City of Sacramento Department of Utilities	
City/Town/Municipality:	Sacramento	
State / Province:	California (CA)	
Country:	USA	
Year:	2020	Financial Year
Start Date:	07/2019	Enter MM/YYYY numeric format
End Date:	06/2020	Enter MM/YYYY numeric format
Audit Preparation Date:	7/30/2020	
Volume Reporting Units:	Acre-feet	
PWSID / Other ID:	3410020	

## The following guidance will help you complete the Audit

All audit data are entered on the [Reporting Worksheet](#)

<input type="text"/>	Value can be entered by user
<input type="text"/>	Value calculated based on input data
<input type="text"/>	These cells contain recommended default values

Use of Option (Radio) Buttons: Pcnt: 0.25% Value:

Select the default percentage by choosing the option button on the left

To enter a value, choose this button and enter a value in the cell to the right

The following worksheets are available by clicking the buttons below or selecting the tabs along the bottom of the page

### Instructions

The current sheet.  
Enter contact information and basic audit details (year, units etc)

### Reporting Worksheet

Enter the required data on this worksheet to calculate the water balance and data grading

### Comments

Enter comments to explain how values were calculated or to document data sources

### Performance Indicators

Review the performance indicators to evaluate the results of the audit

### Water Balance

The values entered in the Reporting Worksheet are used to populate the Water Balance

### Dashboard

A graphical summary of the water balance and Non-Revenue Water components

### Grading Matrix

Presents the possible grading options for each input component of the audit

### Service Connection Diagram

Diagrams depicting possible customer service connection line configurations

### Definitions

Use this sheet to understand the terms used in the audit process

### Loss Control Planning

Use this sheet to interpret the results of the audit validity score and performance indicators

### Example Audits

Reporting Worksheet and Performance Indicators examples are shown for two validated audits

### Acknowledgements

Acknowledgements for the AWWA Free Water Audit Software v5.0

If you have questions or comments regarding the software please contact us via email at: [wlc@awwa.org](mailto:wlc@awwa.org)



# AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Reporting Worksheet

WAS v5.0  
American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

? Click to access definition  
+ Click to add a comment

Water Audit Report for: **City of Sacramento Department of Utilities (3410020)**  
Reporting Year: **2020** 7/2019 - 6/2020

Please enter data in the white cells below. Where available, metered values should be used; if metered values are unavailable please estimate a value. Indicate your confidence in the accuracy of the input data by grading each component (n/a or 1-10) using the drop-down list to the left of the input cell. Hover the mouse over the cell to obtain a description of the grades

**All volumes to be entered as: ACRE-FEET PER YEAR**

To select the correct data grading for each input, determine the highest grade where the utility meets or exceeds all criteria for that grade and all grades below it.

## WATER SUPPLIED

Volume from own sources: + ? 5 101,001.500 acre-ft/yr  
Water imported: + ? n/a 0.000 acre-ft/yr  
Water exported: + ? 5 9,813.900 acre-ft/yr

## Master Meter and Supply Error Adjustments

Pcnt: Value:  
+ ? 5 0.000 acre-ft/yr  
+ ? 5 0.000 acre-ft/yr  
+ ? 5 0.000 acre-ft/yr

Enter negative % or value for under-registration  
Enter positive % or value for over-registration

**WATER SUPPLIED: 91,187.600** acre-ft/yr

## AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION

Billed metered: + ? 7 78,346.580 acre-ft/yr  
Billed unmetered: + ? 7 2,132.000 acre-ft/yr  
Unbilled metered: + ? 9 383.763 acre-ft/yr  
Unbilled unmetered: + ? 5 227.969 acre-ft/yr

Click here: ?  
for help using option  
buttons below

Pcnt: Value:  
0.000 227.969 acre-ft/yr

Use buttons to select  
percentage of water  
supplied  
OR  
value

**AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION: 81,090.312** acre-ft/yr

## WATER LOSSES (Water Supplied - Authorized Consumption)

**10,097.288** acre-ft/yr

### Apparent Losses

Unauthorized consumption: + ? 227.969 acre-ft/yr

Default option selected for unauthorized consumption - a grading of 5 is applied but not displayed

Customer metering inaccuracies: + ? 5 1,606.742 acre-ft/yr  
Systematic data handling errors: + ? 195.866 acre-ft/yr

Default option selected for Systematic data handling errors - a grading of 5 is applied but not displayed

**Apparent Losses: 2,030.577** acre-ft/yr

Pcnt: Value:  
0.25% 0.000 acre-ft/yr

2.00% 0.000 acre-ft/yr  
0.25% 0.000 acre-ft/yr

### Real Losses (Current Annual Real Losses or CARL)

**Real Losses = Water Losses - Apparent Losses: 8,066.711** acre-ft/yr

**WATER LOSSES: 10,097.288** acre-ft/yr

## NON-REVENUE WATER

**NON-REVENUE WATER: 10,709.020** acre-ft/yr

= Water Losses + Unbilled Metered + Unbilled Unmetered

## SYSTEM DATA

Length of mains: + ? 9 1,747.3 miles  
Number of active AND inactive service connections: + ? 9 144,502  
Service connection density: ? 83 conn./mile main

Are customer meters typically located at the curbside or property line? Yes

Average length of customer service line: + ? (length of service line, beyond the property boundary, that is the responsibility of the utility)

Average length of customer service line has been set to zero and a data grading score of 10 has been applied

Average operating pressure: + ? 7 45.0 psi

## COST DATA

Total annual cost of operating water system: + ? 10 \$105,754,535 \$/Year  
Customer retail unit cost (applied to Apparent Losses): + ? 10 \$1.46 \$/100 cubic feet (ccf)  
Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses): + ? 7 \$94.77 \$/acre-ft ☐ Use Customer Retail Unit Cost to value real losses

## WATER AUDIT DATA VALIDITY SCORE:

**\*\*\* YOUR SCORE IS: 66 out of 100 \*\*\***

A weighted scale for the components of consumption and water loss is included in the calculation of the Water Audit Data Validity Score

## PRIORITY AREAS FOR ATTENTION:

Based on the information provided, audit accuracy can be improved by addressing the following components:

1: Volume from own sources

2: Customer metering inaccuracies

3: Billed metered



## AWWA Free Water Audit Software: System Attributes and Performance Indicators

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

Water Audit Report for: City of Sacramento Department of Utilities (3410020)

Reporting Year: 2020 7/2019 - 6/2020

\*\*\* YOUR WATER AUDIT DATA VALIDITY SCORE IS: 66 out of 100 \*\*\*

### System Attributes:

Apparent Losses:	2,030.577	acre-ft/yr
+ Real Losses:	8,066.711	acre-ft/yr
= Water Losses:	10,097.288	acre-ft/yr

? Unavoidable Annual Real Losses (UARL): 1,569.06 acre-ft/yr

Annual cost of Apparent Losses: \$1,290,248

Annual cost of Real Losses: \$764,482 Valued at Variable Production Cost

Return to Reporting Worksheet to change this assumption

### Performance Indicators:

Financial:

Non-revenue water as percent by volume of Water Supplied: 11.7%

Non-revenue water as percent by cost of operating system: 2.0% Real Losses valued at Variable Production Cost

Operational Efficiency:

Apparent Losses per service connection per day: 12.55 gallons/connection/day

Real Losses per service connection per day: 49.84 gallons/connection/day

Real Losses per length of main per day\*: N/A

Real Losses per service connection per day per psi pressure: 1.11 gallons/connection/day/psi

From Above, Real Losses = Current Annual Real Losses (CARL): 8,066.71 acre-feet/year

? Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) [CARL/UARL]: 5.14

\* This performance indicator applies for systems with a low service connection density of less than 32 service connections/mile of pipeline



## AWWA Free Water Audit Software: User Comments

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

Use this worksheet to add comments or notes to explain how an input value was calculated, or to document the sources of the information used.

<b>General Comment:</b>	Department of Utilities Water Loss Control Committee meets for at least three meetings in FY2019 to review, provide input and validate audit data.
Audit Item	Comment
<a href="#">Volume from own sources:</a>	Supplied by Peter Vang. Includes surface water treatment plant and groundwater wells. Influent to WTP is used rather than effluent, as effluent meters do not accurately reflect water leaving the facility. (Note, Mel Raption Honda Service and Haggen Oak Fire Service is supplied water from Sacramento Suburban Water District and the volume supplied by Sacramento Suburban, but billed by City of Sacramento, from last year's reporting it was removed from the total volume in billed metered per the Committee and audit validator input. In FY2019, B. Ewart discussed it is a diminimus and separate area.)
<a href="#">Vol. from own sources: Master meter error adjustment:</a>	Reviewed by Committee. Mag Meter to wholesale customer validated annually.
<a href="#">Water imported:</a>	None.
<a href="#">Water imported: master meter error adjustment:</a>	
<a href="#">Water exported:</a>	Supplied by Peter Vang from Water Production Summary. Reviewed by Committee.
<a href="#">Water exported: master meter error adjustment:</a>	
<a href="#">Billed metered:</a>	Data per accumulated monthly meter queues supplied by Eric Halverson/Nick Liu. Interpolating between metered and unmetered is done on a monthly basis given the changing population of meters in the system, and some filtering is done to strip out records that have extremely high and low durations between meters reads by Brett Ewart. Brett and Eric Halverson reviewed the annual dataset's query that produced the ~81K AF number and found a flaw, which was fixed. After re-running, the new total is ~78K AF, which aligns with Brett's sum of the individual monthly datasets. The revised file is in the CCB FY20 Consumptions by Customer Class FY20 worksheet for the corrected information.
<a href="#">Billed unmetered:</a>	Known metered data is extrapolated by ratio of metered to non-metered customers. B.Ewart estimated metered customers use as the same as unmetered customer's use. The population of meters is changing quickly, the rate they are entered into the billing system changes, and the frequency with which they are read and show up in our system changes too. We continue to see a shift from billed unmetered to billed metered. There is continuous improvement. (Per Brett Ewart.)
<a href="#">Unbilled metered:</a>	We are not capturing that data at this time, but are working on that capability for the near future. (Per Jon Conover and Craig Stevens.)



Audit Item	Comment
<a href="#">Unbilled unmetered:</a>	Custom California default of 0.25 percent was utilized, as was done in previous year per Water Audit Validator and recommended by consultant WSO.
<a href="#">Unauthorized consumption:</a>	
<a href="#">Customer metering inaccuracies:</a>	
<a href="#">Systematic data handling errors:</a>	
<a href="#">Length of mains:</a>	From GIS, Ryan Kirkham on 7-16-2020: Total Supply Main (1.4 miles) + Total Transmission Mains (158 miles) + Total Distribution Mains (1448.4 miles) + Total Service Laterals (139.5 miles) = Length of Mains 1747.30 miles. Can change this to use 2019 DDW Report per the Team (and once we receive approved report.)
<a href="#">Number of active AND inactive service connections:</a>	142,218 (active) +2,166 (fire) + 118 (inactive) = 144,502. (From 12/31/2019 DDW Report.) Represents a midpoint in the year as a representative number for the entire water production year.
<a href="#">Average length of customer service line:</a>	
<a href="#">Average operating pressure:</a>	No change from previous years per Brett Ewart.
<a href="#">Total annual cost of operating water system:</a>	Provided by Diane Naranjo.
<a href="#">Customer retail unit cost (applied to Apparent Losses):</a>	Provided by Diane Naranjo.
<a href="#">Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses):</a>	Provided by Diane Naranjo.



# AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Water Balance

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

Water Audit Report for: **City of Sacramento Department of Utilities (3410020)**  
Reporting Year: **2020**      7/2019 - 6/2020  
Data Validity Score: **66**

Own Sources (Adjusted for known errors)  <
---



## AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Dashboard

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

The graphic below is a visual representation of the Water Balance with bar heights proportional to the volume of the audit components



Water Audit Report for: **City of Sacramento Department of Utilities (3410020)**

Reporting Year: **2020** **7/2019 - 6/2020**

Data Validity Score: **66**

☐ Show me the VOLUME of Non-Revenue Water

☒ Show me the COST of Non-Revenue Water





## AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Grading Matrix

WAS 5.0

American Water Works Association. Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

The grading assigned to each audit component and the corresponding recommended improvements and actions are highlighted in yellow. Audit accuracy is likely to be improved by prioritizing those items shown in red

Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
<b>WATER SUPPLIED</b>											
<b>Volume from own sources:</b>	Select this grading only if the water utility purchases/imports all of its water resources (i.e. has no sources of its own)	Less than 25% of water production sources are metered, remaining sources are estimated. No regular meter accuracy testing or electronic calibration conducted.	25% - 50% of treated water production sources are metered; other sources estimated. No regular meter accuracy testing or electronic calibration conducted.	Conditions between 2 and 4	50% - 75% of treated water production sources are metered, other sources estimated. Occasional meter accuracy testing or electronic calibration conducted.	Conditions between 4 and 6	At least 75% of treated water production sources are metered, <u>or</u> at least 90% of the source flow is derived from metered sources. Meter accuracy testing and/or electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted annually. Less than 25% of tested meters are found outside of +/- 6% accuracy.	Conditions between 6 and 8	100% of treated water production sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted annually, less than 10% of meters are found outside of +/- 6% accuracy	Conditions between 8 and 10	100% of treated water production sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted semi-annually, with less than 10% found outside of +/- 3% accuracy. Procedures are reviewed by a third party knowledgeable in the M36 methodology.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Volume from own Sources" component:		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Organize and launch efforts to collect data for determining volume from own sources	<u>to qualify for 4:</u> Locate all water production sources on maps and in the field, launch meter accuracy testing for existing meters, begin to install meters on unmetered water production sources and replace any obsolete/defective meters.		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Formalize annual meter accuracy testing for all source meters; specify the frequency of testing. Complete installation of meters on unmetered water production sources and complete replacement of all obsolete/defective meters.		<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Conduct annual meter accuracy testing and calibration of related instrumentation on all meter installations on a regular basis. Complete project to install new, or replace defective existing, meters so that entire production meter population is metered. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 6% accuracy.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Maintain annual meter accuracy testing and calibration of related instrumentation for all meter installations. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 3% accuracy. Investigate new meter technology; pilot one or more replacements with innovative meters in attempt to further improve meter accuracy.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Standardize meter accuracy test frequency to semi-annual, or more frequent, for all meters. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 3% accuracy. Continually investigate/pilot improving metering technology.
Volume from own sources master meter and supply error adjustment:	Select n/a only if the water utility fails to have meters on its sources of supply	Inventory information on meters and paper records of measured volumes exist but are incomplete and/or in a very crude condition; data error cannot be determined	No automatic datalogging of production volumes; daily readings are scribed on paper records without any accountability controls. Flows are not balanced across the water distribution system; tank/storage elevation changes are not employed in calculating the "Volume from own sources" component and archived flow data is adjusted only when grossly evident data error occurs.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Production meter data is logged automatically in electronic format and reviewed at least on a monthly basis with necessary corrections implemented. "Volume from own sources" tabulations include estimate of daily changes in tanks/storage facilities. Meter data is adjusted when gross data errors occur, or occasional meter testing deems this necessary.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Hourly production meter data logged automatically & reviewed on at least a weekly basis. Data is adjusted to correct gross error when meter/instrumentation equipment malfunction is detected; and/or error is confirmed by meter accuracy testing. Tank/storage facility elevation changes are automatically used in calculating a balanced "Volume from own sources" component, and data gaps in the archived data are corrected on at least a weekly basis.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Continuous production meter data is logged automatically & reviewed each business day. Data is adjusted to correct gross error from detected meter/instrumentation equipment malfunction and/or results of meter accuracy testing. Tank/storage facility elevation changes are automatically used in "Volume from own sources" tabulations and data gaps in the archived data are corrected on a daily basis.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Computerized system (SCADA or similar) automatically balances flows from all sources and storages; results are reviewed each business day. Tight accountability controls ensure that all data gaps that occur in the archived flow data are quickly detected and corrected. Regular calibrations between SCADA and sources meters ensures minimal data transfer error.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Master meter and supply error adjustment" component:		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Develop a plan to restructure recordkeeping system to capture all flow data; set a procedure to review flow data on a daily basis to detect input errors. Obtain more reliable information about existing meters by conducting field inspections of meters and related instrumentation, and obtaining manufacturer literature.	<u>to qualify for 4:</u> Install automatic datalogging equipment on production meters. Complete installation of level instrumentation at all tanks/storage facilities and include tank level data in automatic calculation routine in a computerized system. Construct a computerized listing or spreadsheet to archive input volumes, tank/storage volume changes and import/export flows in order to determine the composite "Water Supplied" volume for the distribution system. Set a procedure to review this data on a monthly basis to detect gross anomalies and data gaps.		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Refine computerized data collection and archive to include hourly production meter data that is reviewed at least on a weekly basis to detect specific data anomalies and gaps. Use daily net storage change to balance flows in calculating "Water Supplied" volume. Necessary corrections to data errors are implemented on a weekly basis.		<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Ensure that all flow data is collected and archived on at least an hourly basis. All data is reviewed and detected errors corrected each business day. Tank/storage levels variations are employed in calculating balanced "Water Supplied" component. Adjust production meter data for gross error and inaccuracy confirmed by testing.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Link all production and tank/storage facility elevation change data to a Supervisory Control & Data Acquisition (SCADA) System, or similar computerized monitoring/control system, and establish automatic flow balancing algorithm and regularly calibrate between SCADA and source meters. Data is reviewed and corrected each business day.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Monitor meter innovations for development of more accurate and less expensive flowmeters. Continue to replace or repair meters as they perform outside of desired accuracy limits. Stay abreast of new and more accurate water level instruments to better record tank/storage levels and archive the variations in storage volume. Keep current with SCADA and data management systems to ensure that archived data is well-managed and error free.
Water Imported:	Select n/a if the water utility's supply is exclusively from its own water resources (no bulk purchased/ imported water)	Less than 25% of imported water sources are metered, remaining sources are estimated. No regular meter accuracy testing.	25% - 50% of imported water sources are metered; other sources estimated. No regular meter accuracy testing.	Conditions between 2 and 4	50% - 75% of imported water sources are metered, other sources estimated. Occasional meter accuracy testing conducted.	Conditions between 4 and 6	At least 75% of imported water sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and/or electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted annually for all meter installations. Less than 25% of tested meters are found outside of +/- 6% accuracy.	Conditions between 6 and 8	100% of imported water sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted annually, less than 10% of meters are found outside of +/- 6% accuracy	Conditions between 8 and 10	100% of imported water sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted semi-annually for all meter installations, with less than 10% of accuracy tests found outside of +/- 3% accuracy.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Water Imported Volume" component:  (Note: usually the water supplier selling the water - "the Exporter" - to the utility being audited is responsible to maintain the metering installation measuring the imported volume. The utility should coordinate carefully with the Exporter to ensure that adequate meter upkeep takes place and an accurate measure of the Water Imported volume is quantified.)		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Review bulk water purchase agreements with partner suppliers; confirm requirements for use and maintenance of accurate metering. Identify needs for new or replacement meters with goal to meter all imported water sources.	<u>To qualify for 4:</u> Locate all imported water sources on maps and in the field, launch meter accuracy testing for existing meters, begin to install meters on unmetered imported water interconnections and replace obsolete/defective meters.		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Formalize annual meter accuracy testing for all imported water meters, planning for both regular meter accuracy testing and calibration of the related instrumentation. Continue installation of meters on unmetered imported water interconnections and replacement of obsolete/defective meters.		<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Complete project to install new, or replace defective, meters on all imported water interconnections. Maintain annual meter accuracy testing for all imported water meters and conduct calibration of related instrumentation at least annually. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 6% accuracy.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Conduct meter accuracy testing for all meters on a semi-annual basis, along with calibration of all related instrumentation. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 3% accuracy. Investigate new meter technology; pilot one or more replacements with innovative meters in attempt to improve meter accuracy.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Standardize meter accuracy test frequency to semi-annual, or more frequent, for all meters. Continue to conduct calibration of related instrumentation on a semi-annual basis. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 3% accuracy. Continually investigate/pilot improving metering technology.

Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Water imported master meter and supply error adjustment:	Select n/a if the Imported water supply is unmetered, with Imported water quantities estimated on the billing invoices sent by the Exporter to the purchasing Utility.	Inventory information on imported meters and paper records of measured volumes exist but are incomplete and/or in a very crude condition; data error cannot be determined. Written agreement(s) with water Exporter(s) are missing or written in vague language concerning meter management and testing.	No automatic datalogging of imported supply volumes; daily readings are scribed on paper records without any accountability controls to confirm data accuracy and the absence of errors and data gaps in recorded volumes. Written agreement requires meter accuracy testing but is vague on the details of how and who conducts the testing.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Imported supply metered flow data is logged automatically in electronic format and reviewed at least on a monthly basis by the Exporter with necessary corrections implemented. Meter data is adjusted by the Exporter when gross data errors are detected. A coherent data trail exists for this process to protect both the selling and the purchasing Utility. Written agreement exists and clearly states requirements and roles for meter accuracy testing and data management.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Hourly Imported supply metered data is logged automatically & reviewed on at least a weekly basis by the Exporter. Data is adjusted to correct gross error when meter/instrumentation equipment malfunction is detected; and to correct for error confirmed by meter accuracy testing. Any data gaps in the archived data are detected and corrected during the weekly review. A coherent data trail exists for this process to protect both the selling and the purchasing Utility.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Continuous Imported supply metered flow data is logged automatically & reviewed each business day by the Importer. Data is adjusted to correct gross error from detected meter/instrumentation equipment malfunction and/or results of meter accuracy testing. Any data errors/gaps are detected and corrected on a daily basis. A data trail exists for the process to protect both the selling and the purchasing Utility.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Computerized system (SCADA or similar) automatically records data which is reviewed each business day by the Exporter. Tight accountability controls ensure that all error/data gaps that occur in the archived flow data are quickly detected and corrected. A reliable data trail exists and contract provisions for meter testing and data management are reviewed by the selling and purchasing Utility at least once every five years.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Water imported master meter and supply error adjustment" component:		to qualify for 2: Develop a plan to restructure recordkeeping system to capture all flow data; set a procedure to review flow data on a daily basis to detect input errors. Obtain more reliable information about existing meters by conducting field inspections of meters and related instrumentation, and obtaining manufacturer literature. Review the written agreement between the selling and purchasing Utility.	to qualify for 4: Install automatic datalogging equipment on Imported supply meters. Set a procedure to review this data on a monthly basis to detect gross anomalies and data gaps. Launch discussions with the Exporters to jointly review terms of the written agreements regarding meter accuracy testing and data management; revise the terms as necessary.		to qualify for 6: Refine computerized data collection and archive to include hourly Imported supply metered flow data that is reviewed at least on a weekly basis to detect specific data anomalies and gaps. Make necessary corrections to errors/data errors on a weekly basis.		to qualify for 8: Ensure that all Imported supply metered flow data is collected and archived on at least an hourly basis. All data is reviewed and errors/data gaps are corrected each business day.		to qualify for 10: Conduct accountability checks to confirm that all Imported supply metered data is reviewed and corrected each business day by the Exporter. Results of all meter accuracy tests and data corrections should be available for sharing between the Exporter and the purchasing Utility. Establish a schedule for a regular review and updating of the contractual language in the written agreement between the selling and the purchasing Utility; at least every five years.		to maintain 10: Monitor meter innovations for development of more accurate and less expensive flowmeters; work with the Exporter to help identify meter replacement needs. Keep communication lines with Exporters open and maintain productive relations. Keep the written agreement current with clear and explicit language that meets the ongoing needs of all parties.
Water Exported:	Select n/a if the water utility sells no bulk water to neighboring water utilities (no exported water sales)	Less than 25% of exported water sources are metered, remaining sources are estimated. No regular meter accuracy testing.	25% - 50% of exported water sources are metered; other sources estimated. No regular meter accuracy testing.	Conditions between 2 and 4	50% - 75% of exported water sources are metered, other sources estimated. Occasional meter accuracy testing conducted.	Conditions between 4 and 6	At least 75% of exported water sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and/or electronic calibration conducted annually. Less than 25% of tested meters are found outside of +/- 6% accuracy.	Conditions between 6 and 8	100% of exported water sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted annually, less than 10% of meters are found outside of +/- 6% accuracy	Conditions between 8 and 10	100% of exported water sources are metered, meter accuracy testing and electronic calibration of related instrumentation is conducted semi-annually for all meter installations, with less than 10% of accuracy tests found outside of +/- 3% accuracy.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Water Exported Volume" component:  (Note: usually, if the water utility being audited sells (Exports) water to a neighboring purchasing Utility, it is the responsibility of the utility exporting the water to maintain the metering installation measuring the Exported volume. The utility exporting the water should ensure that adequate meter upkeep takes place and an accurate measure of the Water Exported volume is quantified.)		to qualify for 2: Review bulk water sales agreements with purchasing utilities; confirm requirements for use & upkeep of accurate metering. Identify needs to install new, or replace defective meters as needed.	To qualify for 4: Locate all exported water sources on maps and in field, launch meter accuracy testing for existing meters, begin to install meters on unmetered exported water interconnections and replace obsolete/defective meters		to qualify for 6: Formalize annual meter accuracy testing for all exported water meters. Continue installation of meters on unmetered exported water interconnections and replacement of obsolete/defective meters.		to qualify for 8: Complete project to install new, or replace defective, meters on all exported water interconnections. Maintain annual meter accuracy testing for all exported water meters. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 6% accuracy.		to qualify for 10: Maintain annual meter accuracy testing for all meters. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 3% accuracy. Investigate new meter technology; pilot one or more replacements with innovative meters in attempt to improve meter accuracy.		to maintain 10: Standardize meter accuracy test frequency to semi-annual, or more frequent, for all meters. Repair or replace meters outside of +/- 3% accuracy. Continually investigate/pilot improving metering technology.
Water exported master meter and supply error adjustment:	Select n/a only if the water utility fails to have meters on its exported supply interconnections.	Inventory information on exported meters and paper records of measured volumes exist but are incomplete and/or in a very crude condition; data error cannot be determined. Written agreement(s) with the utility purchasing the water are missing or written in vague language concerning meter management and testing.	No automatic datalogging of exported supply volumes; daily readings are scribed on paper records without any accountability controls to confirm data accuracy and the absence of errors and data gaps in recorded volumes. Written agreement requires meter accuracy testing but is vague on the details of how and who conducts the testing.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Exported metered flow data is logged automatically in electronic format and reviewed at least on a monthly basis, with necessary corrections implemented. Meter data is adjusted by the utility selling (exporting) the water when gross data errors are detected. A coherent data trail exists for this process to protect both the utility exporting the water and the purchasing Utility. Written agreement exists and clearly states requirements and roles for meter accuracy testing and data management.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Hourly exported supply metered data is logged automatically & reviewed on at least a weekly basis by the utility selling the water. Data is adjusted to correct gross error when meter/instrumentation equipment malfunction is detected; and to correct for error found by meter accuracy testing. Any data gaps in the archived data are detected and corrected during the weekly review. A coherent data trail exists for this process to protect both the selling (exporting) utility and the purchasing Utility.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Continuous exported supply metered flow data is logged automatically & reviewed each business day by the utility selling (exporting) the water. Data is adjusted to correct gross error from detected meter/instrumentation equipment malfunction and any error confirmed by meter accuracy testing. Any data errors/gaps are detected and corrected on a daily basis. A data trail exists for the process to protect both the selling (exporting) Utility and the purchasing Utility.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Computerized system (SCADA or similar) automatically records data which is reviewed each business day by the utility selling (exporting) the water. Tight accountability controls ensure that all error/data gaps that occur in the archived flow data are quickly detected and corrected. A reliable data trail exists and contract provisions for meter testing and data management are reviewed by the selling Utility and purchasing Utility at least once every five years.

Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Water exported master meter and supply error adjustment" component:		<p>to qualify for 2: Develop a plan to restructure recordkeeping system to capture all flow data; set a procedure to review flow data on a daily basis to detect input errors. Obtain more reliable information about existing meters by conducting field inspections of meters and related instrumentation, and obtaining manufacturer literature. Review the written agreement between the utility selling (exporting) the water and the purchasing Utility.</p>	<p>to qualify for 4: Install automatic datalogging equipment on exported supply meters. Set a procedure to review this data on a monthly basis to detect gross anomalies and data gaps. Launch discussions with the purchasing utilities to jointly review terms of the written agreements regarding meter accuracy testing and data management; revise the terms as necessary.</p>		<p>to qualify for 6: Refine computerized data collection and archive to include hourly exported supply metered flow data that is reviewed at least on a weekly basis to detect specific data anomalies and gaps. Make necessary corrections to errors/data errors on a weekly basis.</p>		<p>to qualify for 8: Ensure that all exported metered flow data is collected and archived on at least an hourly basis. All data is reviewed and errors/data gaps are corrected each business day.</p>		<p>to qualify for 10: Conduct accountability checks to confirm that all exported metered flow data is reviewed and corrected each business day by the utility selling the water. Results of all meter accuracy tests and data corrections should be available for sharing between the utility and the purchasing Utility. Establish a schedule for a regular review and updating of the contractual language in the written agreements with the purchasing utilities; at least every five years.</p>		<p>to maintain 10: Monitor meter innovations for development of more accurate and less expensive flowmeters; work with the purchasing utilities to help identify meter replacement needs. Keep communication lines with the purchasing utilities open and maintain productive relations. Keep the written agreement current with clear and explicit language that meets the ongoing needs of all parties.</p>
AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION											
Billed metered:	n/a (not applicable). Select n/a only if the entire customer population is not metered and is billed for water service on a flat or fixed rate basis. In such a case the volume entered must be zero.	Less than 50% of customers with volume-based billings from meter readings; flat or fixed rate billing exists for the majority of the customer population	At least 50% of customers with volume-based billing from meter reads; flat rate billing for others. Manual meter reading is conducted, with less than 50% meter read success rate, remaining accounts' consumption is estimated. Limited meter records, no regular meter testing or replacement. Billing data maintained on paper records, with no auditing.	Conditions between 2 and 4	At least 75% of customers with volume-based, billing from meter reads; flat or fixed rate billing for remaining accounts. Manual meter reading is conducted with at least 50% meter read success rate; consumption for accounts with failed reads is estimated. Purchase records verify age of customer meters; only very limited meter accuracy testing is conducted. Customer meters are replaced only upon complete failure. Computerized billing records exist, but only sporadic internal auditing conducted.	Conditions between 4 and 6	At least 90% of customers with volume-based billing from meter reads; consumption for remaining accounts is estimated. Manual customer meter reading gives at least 80% customer meter reading success rate; consumption for accounts with failed reads is estimated. Good customer meter records exist, but only limited meter accuracy testing is conducted. Regular replacement is conducted for the oldest meters. Computerized billing records exist with annual auditing of summary statistics conducting by utility personnel.	Conditions between 6 and 8	At least 97% of customers exist with volume-based billing from meter reads. At least 90% customer meter reading success rate; <u>or</u> at least 80% read success rate with planning and budgeting for trials of Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) or Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) in one or more pilot areas. Good customer meter records. Regular meter accuracy testing guides replacement of statistically significant number of meters each year. Routine auditing of computerized billing records for global and detailed statistics occurs annually by utility personnel, and is verified by third party at least once every five years.	Conditions between 8 and 10	At least 99% of customers exist with volume-based billing from meter reads. At least 95% customer meter reading success rate; <u>or</u> minimum 80% meter reading success rate, with Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) or Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) trials underway. Statistically significant customer meter testing and replacement program in place on a continuous basis. Computerized billing with routine, detailed auditing, including field investigation of representative sample of accounts undertaken annually by utility personnel. Audit is conducted by third party auditors at least once every three years.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Billed Metered Consumption" component:	If n/a is selected because the customer meter population is unmetered, consider establishing a new policy to meter the customer population and employ water rates based upon metered volumes.	<p>to qualify for 2: Conduct investigations or trials of customer meters to select appropriate meter models. Budget funding for meter installations. Investigate volume based water rate structures.</p>	<p>to qualify for 4: Purchase and install meters on unmetered accounts. Implement policies to improve meter reading success. Catalog meter information during meter read visits to identify age/model of existing meters. Test a minimal number of meters for accuracy. Install computerized billing system.</p>		<p>to qualify for 6: Purchase and install meters on unmetered accounts. Eliminate flat fee billing and establish appropriate water rate structure based upon measured consumption. Continue to achieve verifiable success in removing manual meter reading barriers. Expand meter accuracy testing. Launch regular meter replacement program. Launch a program of annual auditing of global billing statistics by utility personnel.</p>		<p>to qualify for 8: Purchase and install meters on unmetered accounts. If customer meter reading success rate is less than 97%, assess cost-effectiveness of Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) or Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) system for portion or entire system; <u>or</u> otherwise achieve ongoing improvements in manual meter reading success rate to 97% or higher. Refine meter accuracy testing program. Set meter replacement goals based upon accuracy test results. Implement annual auditing of detailed billing records by utility personnel and implement third party auditing at least once every five years.</p>		<p>to qualify for 10: Purchase and install meters on unmetered accounts. Launch Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) or Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) system trials if manual meter reading success rate of at least 99% is not achieved within a five-year program. Continue meter accuracy testing program. Conduct planning and budgeting for large scale meter replacement based upon meter life cycle analysis using cumulative flow target. Continue annual detailed billing data auditing by utility personnel and conduct third party auditing at least once every three years.</p>		<p>to maintain 10: Continue annual internal billing data auditing, and third party auditing at least every three years. Continue customer meter accuracy testing to ensure that accurate customer meter readings are obtained and entered as the basis for volume based billing. Stay abreast of improvements in Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) and Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) and information management. Plan and budget for justified upgrades in metering, meter reading and billing data management to maintain very high accuracy in customer metering and billing.</p>
Billed unmetered:	Select n/a if it is the policy of the water utility to meter all customer connections, and it has been confirmed by detailed auditing that all customers do indeed have a water meter; i.e. no intentionally unmetered accounts exist	Water utility policy does <u>not</u> require customer metering; flat or fixed fee billing is employed. No data is collected on customer consumption. The only estimates of customer population consumption available are derived from data estimation methods using average fixture count multiplied by number of connections, or similar approach.	Water utility policy does <u>not</u> require customer metering; flat or fixed fee billing is employed. Some metered accounts exist in parts of the system (pilot areas or District Metered Areas) with consumption read periodically or recorded on portable dataloggers over one, three, or seven day periods. Data from these sample meters are used to infer consumption for the total customer population. Site specific estimation methods are used for unusual buildings/water uses.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Water utility policy <u>does</u> require metering and volume based billing in general. However, a liberal amount of exemptions and a lack of clearly written and communicated procedures result in up to 20% of billed accounts believed to be unmetered by exemption; or the water utility is in transition to becoming fully metered, and a large number of customers remain unmetered. A rough estimate of the annual consumption for all unmetered accounts is included in the annual water audit, with no inspection of individual unmetered accounts.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Water utility policy <u>does</u> require metering and volume based billing but established exemptions exist for a portion of accounts such as municipal buildings. As many as 15% of billed accounts are unmetered due to this exemption or meter installation difficulties. Only a group estimate of annual consumption for all unmetered accounts is included in the annual water audit, with no inspection of individual unmetered accounts.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Water utility policy <u>does</u> require metering and volume based billing for all customer accounts. However, less than 5% of billed accounts remain unmetered because meter installation is hindered by unusual circumstances. The goal is to minimize the number of unmetered accounts. Reliable estimates of consumption are obtained for these unmetered accounts via site specific estimation methods.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Water utility policy <u>does</u> require metering and volume based billing for all customer accounts. Less than 2% of billed accounts are unmetered and exist because meter installation is hindered by unusual circumstances. The goal exists to minimize the number of unmetered accounts to the extent that is economical. Reliable estimates of consumption are obtained at these accounts via site specific estimation methods.

Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Billed Unmetered Consumption" component:		<p><u>to qualify for 2:</u> Conduct research and evaluate cost/benefit of a new water utility policy to require metering of the customer population; thereby greatly reducing or eliminating unmetered accounts. Conduct pilot metering project by installing water meters in small sample of customer accounts and periodically reading the meters or datalogging the water consumption over one, three, or seven day periods.</p>	<p><u>to qualify for 4:</u> Implement a new water utility policy requiring customer metering. Launch or expand pilot metering study to include several different meter types, which will provide data for economic assessment of full scale metering options. Assess sites with access difficulties to devise means to obtain water consumption volumes. Begin customer meter installation.</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 6:</u> Refine policy and procedures to improve customer metering participation for all but solidly exempt accounts. Assign staff resources to review billing records to identify errant unmetered properties. Specify metering needs and funding requirements to install sufficient meters to significant reduce the number of unmetered accounts</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 8:</u> Push to install customer meters on a full scale basis. Refine metering policy and procedures to ensure that all accounts including municipal properties, are designated for meters. Plan special efforts to address "hard-to-access" accounts. Implement procedures to obtain a reliable consumption estimate for the remaining few unmetered accounts awaiting meter installation.</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 10:</u> Continue customer meter installation throughout the service area, with a goal to minimize unmetered accounts. Sustain the effort to investigate accounts with access difficulties, and devise means to install water meters or otherwise measure water consumption.</p>		<p><u>to maintain 10:</u> Continue to refine estimation methods for unmetered consumption and explore means to establish metering, for as many billed remaining unmetered accounts as is economically feasible.</p>
Unbilled metered:	select n/a if all billing-exempt consumption is unmetered.	<p>Billing practices exempt certain accounts, such as municipal buildings, but written policies do not exist; and a reliable count of unbilled metered accounts is unavailable. Meter upkeep and meter reading on these accounts is rare and not considered a priority. Due to poor recordkeeping and lack of auditing, water consumption for all such accounts is purely guesstimated.</p>	<p>Billing practices exempt certain accounts, such as municipal buildings, but only scattered, dated written directives exist to justify this practice. A reliable count of unbilled metered accounts is unavailable. Sporadic meter replacement and meter reading occurs on an as-needed basis. The total annual water consumption for all unbilled, metered accounts is estimated based upon approximating the number of accounts and assigning consumption from actively billed accounts of same meter size.</p>	Conditions between 2 and 4	<p>Dated written procedures permit billing exemption for specific accounts, such as municipal properties, but are unclear regarding certain other types of accounts. Meter reading is given low priority and is sporadic. Consumption is quantified from meter readings where available. The total number of unbilled, unmetered accounts must be estimated along with consumption volumes.</p>	Conditions between 4 and 6	<p>Written policies regarding billing exemptions exist but adherence in practice is questionable. Metering and meter reading for municipal buildings is reliable but sporadic for other unbilled metered accounts. Periodic auditing of such accounts is conducted. Water consumption is quantified directly from meter readings where available, but the majority of the consumption is estimated.</p>	Conditions between 6 and 8	<p>Written policy identifies the types of accounts granted a billing exemption. Customer meter management and meter reading are considered secondary priorities, but meter reading is conducted at least annually to obtain consumption volumes for the annual water audit. High level auditing of billing records ensures that a reliable census of such accounts exists.</p>	Conditions between 8 and 10	<p>Clearly written policy identifies the types of accounts given a billing exemption, with emphasis on keeping such accounts to a minimum. Customer meter management and meter reading for these accounts is given proper priority and is reliably conducted. Regular auditing confirms this. Total water consumption for these accounts is taken from reliable readings from accurate meters.</p>
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Unbilled Metered Consumption" component:		<p><u>to qualify for 2:</u> Reassess the water utility's policy allowing certain accounts to be granted a billing exemption. Draft an outline of a new written policy for billing exemptions, with clear justification as to why any accounts should be exempt from metering, and with the intention to keep the number of such accounts to a minimum.</p>	<p><u>to qualify for 4:</u> Review historic written directives and policy documents allowing certain accounts to be billing-exempt. Draft an outline of a written policy for billing exemptions, identify criteria that grant an exemption, with a goal of keeping the number of accounts to a minimum. Consider increasing the priority of reading meters on unbilled accounts at least annually.</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 6:</u> Draft a new written policy regarding billing exemptions based upon consensus criteria allowing this occurrence. Assign resources to audit meter records and billing records to obtain census of unbilled metered accounts. Gradually include a greater number of these metered accounts to the routes for regular meter reading.</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 8:</u> Communicate billing exemption policy throughout the organization and implement procedures that ensure proper account management. Conduct inspections of accounts confirmed in unbilled metered status and verify that accurate meters exist and are scheduled for routine meter readings. Gradually increase the number of unbilled metered accounts that are included in regular meter reading routes.</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 10:</u> Ensure that meter management (meter accuracy testing, meter replacement) and meter reading activities for unbilled accounts are accorded the same priority as billed accounts. Establish ongoing annual auditing process to ensure that water consumption is reliably collected and provided to the annual water audit process.</p>		<p><u>to maintain 10:</u> Reassess the utility's philosophy in allowing any water uses to go "unbilled". It is possible to meter and bill all accounts, even if the fee charged for water consumption is discounted or waived. Metering and billing all accounts ensures that water consumption is tracked and water waste from plumbing leaks is detected and minimized.</p>
Unbilled unmetered:		<p>Extent of unbilled, unmetered consumption is unknown due to unclear policies and poor recordkeeping. Total consumption is quantified based upon a purely subjective estimate.</p>	<p>Clear extent of unbilled, unmetered consumption is unknown, but a number of events are randomly documented each year, confirming existence of such consumption, but without sufficient documentation to quantify an accurate estimate of the annual volume consumed.</p>	Conditions between 2 and 4	<p>Extent of unbilled, unmetered consumption is partially known, and procedures exist to document certain events such as miscellaneous fire hydrant uses. Formulae is used to quantify the consumption from such events (time running multiplied by typical flowrate, multiplied by number of events).</p>	<p>Default value of 1.25% of system input volume is employed</p>	<p>Coherent policies exist for some forms of unbilled, unmetered consumption but others await closer evaluation. Reasonable recordkeeping for the managed uses exists and allows for annual volumes to be quantified by inference, but unsupervised uses are guesstimated.</p>	Conditions between 6 and 8	<p>Clear policies and good recordkeeping exist for some uses (ex: water used in periodic testing of unmetered fire connections), but other uses (ex: miscellaneous uses of fire hydrants) have limited oversight. Total consumption is a mix of well quantified use such as from formulae (time running multiplied by typical flow, multiplied by number of events) or temporary meters, and relatively subjective estimates of less regulated use.</p>	Conditions between 8 and 10	<p>Clear policies exist to identify permitted use of water in unbilled, unmetered fashion, with the intention of minimizing this type of consumption. Good records document each occurrence and consumption is quantified via formulae (time running multiplied by typical flow, multiplied by number of events) or use of temporary meters.</p>
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Unbilled Unmetered Consumption" component:		<p><u>to qualify for 5:</u> Utilize the accepted default value of 1.25% of the volume of water supplied as an expedient means to gain a reasonable quantification of this use.</p> <p><u>to qualify for 2:</u> Establish a policy regarding what water uses should be allowed to remain as unbilled and unmetered. Consider tracking a small sample of one such use (ex: fire hydrant flushings).</p>	<p><u>to qualify for 5:</u> Utilize accepted default value of 1.25% of the volume of water supplied as an expedient means to gain a reasonable quantification of this use.</p> <p><u>to qualify for 4:</u> Evaluate the documentation of events that have been observed. Meet with user groups (ex: for fire hydrants - fire departments, contractors to ascertain their need and/or volume requirements for water from fire hydrants).</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 5:</u> Utilize accepted default value of 1.25% of the volume of water supplied as an expedient means to gain a reasonable quantification of all such use. This is particularly appropriate for water utilities who are in the early stages of the water auditing process, and should focus on other components since the volume of unbilled, unmetered consumption is usually a relatively small quantity component, and other larger-quantity components should take priority.</p>	<p><u>to qualify for 6 or greater:</u> Finalize policy and begin to conduct field checks to better establish and quantify such usage. Proceed if top-down audit exists and/or a great volume of such use is suspected.</p>	<p><u>to qualify for 8:</u> Assess water utility policy and procedures for various unmetered usages. For example, ensure that a policy exists and permits are issued for use of fire hydrants by persons outside of the utility. Create written procedures for use and documentation of fire hydrants by water utility personnel. Use same approach for other types of unbilled, unmetered water usage.</p>		<p><u>to qualify for 10:</u> Refine written procedures to ensure that all uses of unbilled, unmetered water are overseen by a structured permitting process managed by water utility personnel. Reassess policy to determine if some of these uses have value in being converted to billed and/or metered status.</p>		<p><u>to maintain 10:</u> Continue to refine policy and procedures with intention of reducing the number of allowable uses of water in unbilled and unmetered fashion. Any uses that can feasibly become billed and metered should be converted eventually.</p>
APPARENT LOSSES											



Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Unauthorized consumption:		Extent of unauthorized consumption is unknown due to unclear policies and poor recordkeeping. Total unauthorized consumption is guesstimated.	Unauthorized consumption is a known occurrence, but its extent is a mystery. There are no requirements to document observed events, but periodic field reports capture some of these occurrences. Total unauthorized consumption is approximated from this limited data.	conditions between 2 and 4	Procedures exist to document some unauthorized consumption such as observed unauthorized fire hydrant openings. Use formulae to quantify this consumption (time running multiplied typical flowrate, multiplied by number of events).	Default value of 0.25% of volume of water supplied is employed	Coherent policies exist for some forms of unauthorized consumption (more than simply fire hydrant misuse) but others await closer evaluation. Reasonable surveillance and recordkeeping exist for occurrences that fall under the policy. Volumes quantified by inference from these records.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Clear policies and good auditable recordkeeping exist for certain events (ex: tampering with water meters, illegal bypasses of customer meters); but other occurrences have limited oversight. Total consumption is a combination of volumes from formulae (time x typical flow) and subjective estimates of unconfirmed consumption.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Clear policies exist to identify all known unauthorized uses of water. Staff and procedures exist to provide enforcement of policies and detect violations. Each occurrence is recorded and quantified via formulae (estimated time running multiplied by typical flow) or similar methods. All records and calculations should exist in a form that can be audited by a third party.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Unauthorized Consumption" component:		<p>to qualify for 5:</p> Use accepted default of 0.25% of volume of water supplied.	<p>to qualify for 5:</p> Use accepted default of 0.25% of system input volume	<p>to qualify for 4:</p> Review utility policy regarding what water uses are considered unauthorized, and consider tracking a small sample of one such occurrence (ex: unauthorized fire hydrant openings)	<p>to qualify for 5:</p> Utilize accepted default value of 0.25% of volume of water supplied as an expedient means to gain a reasonable quantification of all such use. This is particularly appropriate for water utilities who are in the early stages of the water auditing process.	<p>to qualify for 6 or greater:</p> Finalize policy updates to clearly identify the types of water consumption that are authorized from those usages that fall outside of this policy and are, therefore, unauthorized. Begin to conduct regular field checks. Proceed if the top-down audit already exists and/or a great volume of such use is suspected.	<p>to qualify for 8:</p> Assess water utility policies to ensure that all known occurrences of unauthorized consumption are outlawed, and that appropriate penalties are prescribed. Create written procedures for detection and documentation of various occurrences of unauthorized consumption as they are uncovered.		<p>to qualify for 10:</p> Refine written procedures and assign staff to seek out likely occurrences of unauthorized consumption. Explore new locking devices, monitors and other technologies designed to detect and thwart unauthorized consumption.		<p>to maintain 10:</p> Continue to refine policy and procedures to eliminate any loopholes that allow or tacitly encourage unauthorized consumption. Continue to be vigilant in detection, documentation and enforcement efforts.
Customer metering inaccuracies:	select n/a only if the entire customer population is unmetered. In such a case the volume entered must be zero.	Customer meters exist, but with unorganized paper records on meters; no meter accuracy testing or meter replacement program for any size of retail meter. Metering workflow is driven chaotically with no proactive management. Loss volume due to aggregate meter inaccuracy is guesstimated.	Poor recordkeeping and meter oversight is recognized by water utility management who has allotted staff and funding resources to organize improved recordkeeping and start meter accuracy testing. Existing paper records gathered and organized to provide cursory disposition of meter population. Customer meters are tested for accuracy only upon customer request.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Reliable recordkeeping exists; meter information is improving as meters are replaced. Meter accuracy testing is conducted annually for a small number of meters (more than just customer requests, but less than 1% of inventory). A limited number of the oldest meters are replaced each year. Inaccuracy volume is largely an estimate, but refined based upon limited testing data.	Conditions between 4 and 6	A reliable electronic recordkeeping system for meters exists. The meter population includes a mix of new high performing meters and dated meters with suspect accuracy. Routine, but limited, meter accuracy testing and meter replacement occur. Inaccuracy volume is quantified using a mix of reliable and less certain data.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Ongoing meter replacement and accuracy testing result in highly accurate customer meter population. Statistically significant number of meters are tested in audit year. This testing is conducted on samples of meters of varying age and accumulated volume of throughput to determine optimum replacement time for various types of meters.	Ongoing meter replacement and accuracy testing result in highly accurate customer meter population. Statistically significant number of meters are tested in audit year. This testing is conducted on samples of meters of varying age and accumulated volume of throughput to determine optimum replacement time for these meters.	Good records of all active customer meters exist and include as a minimum: meter number, account number/location, type, size and manufacturer. Ongoing meter replacement occurs according to a targeted and justified basis. Regular meter accuracy testing gives a reliable measure of composite inaccuracy volume for the customer meter population. New metering technology is embraced to keep overall accuracy improving. Procedures are reviewed by a third party knowledgeable in the M36 methodology.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Customer meter inaccuracy volume" component:	If n/a is selected because the customer meter population is unmetered, consider establishing a new policy to meter the customer population and employ water rates based upon metered volumes.	<p>to qualify for 2:</p> Gather available meter purchase records. Conduct testing on a small number of meters believed to be the most inaccurate. Review staffing needs of the metering group and budget for necessary resources to better organize meter management.	<p>to qualify for 4:</p> Implement a reliable record keeping system for customer meter histories, preferably using electronic methods typically linked to, or part of, the Customer Billing System or Customer Information System. Expand meter accuracy testing to a larger group of meters.		<p>to qualify for 6:</p> Standardize the procedures for meter recordkeeping within an electronic information system. Accelerate meter accuracy testing and meter replacements guided by testing results.		<p>to qualify for 8:</p> Expand annual meter accuracy testing to evaluate a statistically significant number of meter makes/models. Expand meter replacement program to replace statistically significant number of poor performing meters each year.		<p>to qualify for 9:</p> Continue efforts to manage meter population with reliable recordkeeping. Test a statistically significant number of meters each year and analyze test results in an ongoing manner to serve as a basis for a target meter replacement strategy based upon accumulated volume throughput.	<p>to qualify for 10:</p> Continue efforts to manage meter population with reliable recordkeeping, meter testing and replacement. Evaluate new meter types and install one or more types in 5-10 customer accounts each year in order to pilot improving metering technology.	<p>to maintain 10:</p> Increase the number of meters tested and replaced as justified by meter accuracy test data. Continually monitor development of new metering technology and Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) to grasp opportunities for greater accuracy in metering of water flow and management of customer consumption data.



Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Systematic Data Handling Errors:	Note: all water utilities incur some amount of this error. Even in water utilities with unmetered customer populations and fixed rate billing, errors occur in annual billing tabulations. Enter a positive value for the volume and select a grading.	Policies and procedures for activation of new customer water billing accounts are vague and lack accountability. Billing data is maintained on paper records which are not well organized. No auditing is conducted to confirm billing data handling efficiency. An unknown number of customers escape routine billing due to lack of billing process oversight.	Policy and procedures for activation of new customer accounts and oversight of billing records exist but need refinement. Billing data is maintained on paper records or insufficiently capable electronic database. Only periodic unstructured auditing work is conducted to confirm billing data handling efficiency. The volume of unbilled water due to billing lapses is a guess.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Policy and procedures for new account activation and oversight of billing operations exist but needs refinement. Computerized billing system exists, but is dated or lacks needed functionality. Periodic, limited internal audits conducted and confirm with approximate accuracy the consumption volumes lost to billing lapses.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Policy and procedures for new account activation and oversight of billing operations is adequate and reviewed periodically. Computerized billing system is in use with basic reporting available. Any effect of billing adjustments on measured consumption volumes is well understood. Internal checks of billing data error conducted annually. Reasonably accurate quantification of consumption volume lost to billing lapses is obtained.	Conditions between 6 and 8	New account activation and billing operations policy and procedures are reviewed at least biannually. Computerized billing system includes an array of reports to confirm billing data and system functionality. Checks are conducted routinely to flag and explain zero consumption accounts. Annual internal checks conducted with third party audit conducted at least once every five years. Accountability checks flag billing lapses. Consumption lost to billing lapses is well quantified and reducing year-by-year.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Sound written policy and procedures exist for new account activation and oversight of customer billing operations. Robust computerized billing system gives high functionality and reporting capabilities which are utilized, analyzed and the results reported each billing cycle. Assessment of policy and data handling errors are conducted internally and audited by third party at least once every three years, ensuring consumption lost to billing lapses is minimized and detected as it occurs.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Systematic Data Handling Error volume" component:		to qualify for 2: Draft written policy and procedures for activating new water billing accounts and oversight of billing operations. Investigate and budget for computerized customer billing system. Conduct initial audit of billing records by flow-charting the basic business processes of the customer account/billing function.	to qualify for 4: Finalize written policy and procedures for activation of new billing accounts and overall billing operations management. Implement a computerized customer billing system. Conduct initial audit of billing records as part of this process.		to qualify for 6: Refine new account activation and billing operations procedures and ensure consistency with the utility policy regarding billing, and minimize opportunity for missed billings. Upgrade or replace customer billing system for needed functionality - ensure that billing adjustments don't corrupt the value of consumption volumes. Procedurize internal annual audit process.		to qualify for 8: Formalize regular review of new account activation process and general billing practices. Enhance reporting capability of computerized billing system. Formalize regular auditing process to reveal scope of data handling error. Plan for periodic third party audit to occur at least once every five years.		to qualify for 10: Close policy/procedure loopholes that allow some customer accounts to go unbilled, or data handling errors to exist. Ensure that billing system reports are utilized, analyzed and reported every billing cycle. Ensure that internal and third party audits are conducted at least once every three years.		to maintain 10: Stay abreast of customer information management developments and innovations. Monitor developments of Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) and integrate technology to ensure that customer endpoint information is well-monitored and errors/lapses are at an economic minimum.
SYSTEM DATA											
Length of mains:		Poorly assembled and maintained paper as-built records of existing water main installations makes accurate determination of system pipe length impossible. Length of mains is guesstimated.	Paper records in poor or uncertain condition (no annual tracking of installations & abandonments). Poor procedures to ensure that new water mains installed by developers are accurately documented.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Sound written policy and procedures exist for documenting new water main installations, but gaps in management result in an uncertain degree of error in tabulation of mains length.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Sound written policy and procedures exist for permitting and commissioning new water mains. Highly accurate paper records with regular field validation; or electronic records and asset management system in good condition. Includes system backup.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Sound written policy and procedures exist for permitting and commissioning new water mains. Electronic recordkeeping such as a Geographical Information System (GIS) and asset management system are used to store and manage data.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Sound written policy exists for managing water mains extensions and replacements. Geographic Information System (GIS) data and asset management database agree and random field validation proves truth of databases. Records of annual field validation should be available for review.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Length of Water Mains" component:		to qualify for 2: Assign personnel to inventory current as-built records and compare with customer billing system records and highway plans in order to verify poorly documented pipelines. Assemble policy documents regarding permitting and documentation of water main installations by the utility and building developers; identify gaps in procedures that result in poor documentation of new water main installations.	to qualify for 4: Complete inventory of paper records of water main installations for several years prior to audit year. Review policy and procedures for commissioning and documenting new water main installation.		to qualify for 6: Finalize updates/improvements to written policy and procedures for permitting/commissioning new main installations. Confirm inventory of records for five years prior to audit year; correct any errors or omissions.		to qualify for 8: Launch random field checks of limited number of locations. Convert to electronic database such as a Geographic Information System (GIS) with backup as justified. Develop written policy and procedures.		to qualify for 10: Link Geographic Information System (GIS) and asset management databases, conduct field verification of data. Record field verification information at least annually.		to maintain 10: Continue with standardization and random field validation to improve the completeness and accuracy of the system.
Number of active AND inactive service connections:		Vague permitting (of new service connections) policy and poor paper recordkeeping of customer connections/billings result in suspect determination of the number of service connections, which may be 10-15% in error from actual count.	General permitting policy exists but paper records, procedural gaps, and weak oversight result in questionable total for number of connections, which may vary 5-10% of actual count.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Written account activation policy and procedures exist, but with some gaps in performance and oversight. Computerized information management system is being brought online to replace dated paper recordkeeping system. Reasonably accurate tracking of service connection installations & abandonments; but count can be up to 5% in error from actual total.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Written new account activation and overall billing policies and procedures are adequate and reviewed periodically. Computerized information management system is in use with annual installations & abandonments totaled. Very limited field verifications and audits. Error in count of number of service connections is believed to be no more than 3%.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Policies and procedures for new account activation and overall billing operations are written, well-structured and reviewed at least biannually. Well-managed computerized information management system exists and routine, periodic field checks and internal system audits are conducted. Counts of connections are no more than 2% in error.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Sound written policy and well managed and audited procedures ensure reliable management of service connection population. Computerized information management system, Customer Billing System, and Geographic Information System (GIS) information agree; field validation proves truth of databases. Count of connections recorded as being in error is less than 1% of the entire population.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Number of Active and Inactive Service Connections" component:	Note: The number of Service Connections does not include fire hydrant leads/lines connecting the hydrant to the water main	to qualify for 2: Draft new policy and procedures for new account activation and overall billing operations. Research and collect paper records of installations & abandonments for several years prior to audit year.	to qualify for 4: Refine policy and procedures for new account activation and overall billing operations. Research computerized recordkeeping system (Customer Information System or Customer Billing System) to improve documentation format for service connections.		to qualify for 6: Refine procedures to ensure consistency with new account activation and overall billing policy to establish new service connections or decommission existing connections. Improve process to include all totals for at least five years prior to audit year.		to qualify for 8: Formalize regular review of new account activation and overall billing operations policies and procedures. Launch random field checks of limited number of locations. Develop reports and auditing mechanisms for computerized information management system.		to qualify for 10: Close any procedural loopholes that allow installations to go undocumented. Link computerized information management system with Geographic Information System (GIS) and formalize field inspection and information system auditing processes. Documentation of new or decommissioned service connections encounters several levels of checks and balances.		to maintain 10: Continue with standardization and random field validation to improve knowledge of system.
	Note: if customer water	Gratings 1-9 apply if customer properties are unmetered, if customer meters exist and are located inside the customer building premises, or if the water utility owns and is responsible for the entire service connection piping from the water main to the customer building. In any of these cases the average distance between the curb stop or boundary separating utility/customer responsibility for service connection piping, and the typical first point of use (ex: faucet) or the customer meter must be quantified. Gratings of 1-9 are used to grade the validity of the means to quantify this value. (See the "Service Connection Diagram" worksheet)									Either of two conditions can be met for a grading of 10:

Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Average length of customer service line:	meters are located outside of the customer building next to the curb stop or boundary separating utility/customer responsibility, then the auditor should answer "Yes" to the question on the Reporting Worksheet asking about this. If the answer is Yes, the grading description listed under the Grading of 10(a) will be followed, with a value of zero automatically entered at a Grading of 10. See the Service Connection Diagram worksheet for a visual presentation of this distance.	Vague policy exists to define the delineation of water utility ownership and customer ownership of the service connection piping. Curb stops are perceived as the breakpoint but these have not been well-maintained or documented. Most are buried or obscured. Their location varies widely from site-to-site, and estimating this distance is arbitrary due to the unknown location of many curb stops.	Policy requires that the curb stop serves as the delineation point between water utility ownership and customer ownership of the service connection piping. The piping from the water main to the curb stop is the property of the water utility; and the piping from the curb stop to the customer building is owned by the customer. Curb stop locations are not well documented and the average distance is based upon a limited number of locations measured in the field.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Good policy requires that the curb stop serves as the delineation point between water utility ownership and customer ownership of the service connection piping. Curb stops are generally installed as needed and are reasonably documented. Their location varies widely from site-to-site, and an estimate of this distance is hindered by the availability of paper records of limited accuracy.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Clear written policy exists to define utility/customer responsibility for service connection piping. Accurate, well-maintained paper or basic electronic recordkeeping system exists. Periodic field checks confirm piping lengths for a sample of customer properties.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Clearly worded policy standardizes the location of curb stops and meters, which are inspected upon installation. Accurate and well maintained electronic records exist with periodic field checks to confirm locations of service lines, curb stops and customer meter pits. An accurate number of customer properties from the customer billing system allows for reliable averaging of this length.	Conditions between 8 and 10	a) Customer water meters exist outside of customer buildings next to the curb stop or boundary separating utility/customer responsibility for service connection piping. If so, answer "Yes" to the question on the Reporting Worksheet asking about this condition. A value of zero and a Grading of 10 are automatically entered in the Reporting Worksheet. b) Meters exist inside customer buildings, or properties are unmeasured. In either case, answer "No" to the Reporting Worksheet question on meter location, and enter a distance determined by the auditor. For a Grading of 10 this value must be a very reliable number from a Geographic Information System (GIS) and confirmed by a statistically valid number of field checks.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Average Length of Customer Service Line" component:		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Research and collect paper records of service line installations. Inspect several sites in the field using pipe locators to locate curb stops. Obtain the length of this small sample of connections in this manner.	<u>to qualify for 4:</u> Formalize and communicate policy delineating utility/customer responsibilities for service connection piping. Assess accuracy of paper records by field inspection of a small sample of service connections using pipe locators as needed. Research the potential migration to a computerized information management system to store service connection data.		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Establish coherent procedures to ensure that policy for curb stop, meter installation and documentation is followed. Gain consensus within the water utility for the establishment of a computerized information management system.		<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Implement an electronic means of recordkeeping, typically via a customer information system, customer billing system, or Geographic Information System (GIS). Standardize the process to conduct field checks of a limited number of locations.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Link customer information management system and Geographic Information System (GIS), standardize process for field verification of data.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Continue with standardization and random field validation to improve knowledge of service connection configurations and customer meter locations.
Average operating pressure:		Available records are poorly assembled and maintained paper records of supply pump characteristics and water distribution system operating conditions. Average pressure is guesstimated based upon this information and ground elevations from crude topographical maps. Widely varying distribution system pressures due to undulating terrain, high system head loss and weak/erratic pressure controls further compromise the validity of the average pressure calculation.	Limited telemetry monitoring of scattered pumping station and water storage tank sites provides some static pressure data, which is recorded in handwritten logbooks. Pressure data is gathered at individual sites only when low pressure complaints arise. Average pressure is determined by averaging relatively crude data, and is affected by significant variation in ground elevations, system head loss and gaps in pressure controls in the distribution system.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Effective pressure controls separate different pressure zones; moderate pressure variation across the system, occasional open boundary valves are discovered that breach pressure zones. Basic telemetry monitoring of the distribution system logs pressure data electronically. Pressure data gathered by gauges or dataloggers at fire hydrants or buildings when low pressure complaints arise, and during fire flow tests and system flushing. Reliable topographical data exists. Average pressure is calculated using this mix of data.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Reliable pressure controls separate distinct pressure zones; only very occasional open boundary valves are encountered that breach pressure zones. Well-covered telemetry monitoring of the distribution system (not just pumping at source treatment plants or wells) logs extensive pressure data electronically. Pressure gathered by gauges/dataloggers at fire hydrants and buildings when low pressure complaints arise, and during fire flow tests and system flushing. Average pressure is determined by using this mix of reliable data.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Well-managed, discrete pressure zones exist with generally predictable pressure fluctuations. A current full-scale SCADA System or similar realtime monitoring system exists to monitor the water distribution system and collect data, including real time pressure readings at representative sites across the system. The average system pressure is determined from reliable monitoring system data.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Well-managed pressure districts/zones, SCADA System and hydraulic model exist to give very precise pressure data across the water distribution system. Average system pressure is reliably calculated from extensive, reliable, and cross-checked data. Calculations are reported on an annual basis as a minimum.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Average Operating Pressure" component:		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Employ pressure gauging and/or datalogging equipment to obtain pressure measurements from fire hydrants. Locate accurate topographical maps of service area in order to confirm ground elevations. Research pump data sheets to find pump pressure/flow characteristics	<u>to qualify for 4:</u> Formalize a procedure to use pressure gauging/datalogging equipment to gather pressure data during various system events such as low pressure complaints, or operational testing. Gather pump pressure and flow data at different flow regimes. Identify faulty pressure controls (pressure reducing valves, altitude valves, partially open boundary valves) and plan to properly configure pressure zones. Make all pressure data from these efforts available to generate system-wide average pressure.		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Expand the use of pressure gauging/datalogging equipment to gather scattered pressure data at a representative set of sites, based upon pressure zones or areas. Utilize pump pressure and flow data to determine supply head entering each pressure zone or district. Correct any faulty pressure controls (pressure reducing valves, altitude valves, partially open boundary valves) to ensure properly configured pressure zones. Use expanded pressure dataset from these activities to generate system-wide average pressure.		<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Install a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) System, or similar realtime monitoring system, to monitor system parameters and control operations. Set regular calibration schedule for instrumentation to insure data accuracy. Obtain accurate topographical data and utilize pressure data gathered from field surveys to provide extensive, reliable data for pressure averaging.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Annually, obtain a system-wide average pressure value from the hydraulic model of the distribution system that has been calibrated via field measurements in the water distribution system and confirmed in comparisons with SCADA System data.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Continue to refine the hydraulic model of the distribution system and consider linking it with SCADA System for real-time pressure data calibration, and averaging.

Grading >>>	n/a	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
COST DATA											
Total annual cost of operating water system:		Incomplete paper records and lack of financial accounting documentation on many operating functions makes calculation of water system operating costs a pure guesstimate	Reasonably maintained, but incomplete, paper or electronic accounting provides data to estimate the major portion of water system operating costs.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Electronic, industry-standard cost accounting system in place. However, gaps in data are known to exist, periodic internal reviews are conducted but not a structured financial audit.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Reliable electronic, industry-standard cost accounting system in place, with all pertinent water system operating costs tracked. Data audited periodically by utility personnel, but not a Certified Public Accountant (CPA).	Conditions between 6 and 8	Reliable electronic, industry-standard cost accounting system in place, with all pertinent water system operating costs tracked. Data audited at least annually by utility personnel, and at least once every three years by third-party CPA.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Reliable electronic, industry-standard cost accounting system in place, with all pertinent water system operating costs tracked. Data audited annually by utility personnel and annually also by third-party CPA.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Total Annual Cost of Operating the Water System" component:		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Gather available records, institute new financial accounting procedures to regularly collect and audit basic cost data of most important operations functions.	<u>to qualify for 4:</u> Implement an electronic cost accounting system, structured according to accounting standards for water utilities		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Establish process for periodic internal audit of water system operating costs; identify cost data gaps and institute procedures for tracking these outstanding costs.		<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Standardize the process to conduct routine financial audit on an annual basis. Arrange for CPA audit of financial records at least once every three years.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Standardize the process to conduct a third-party financial audit by a CPA on an annual basis.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Maintain program, stay abreast of expenses subject to erratic cost changes and long-term cost trend, and budget/track costs proactively
Customer retail unit cost (applied to Apparent Losses):	Customer population unmetered, and/or only a fixed fee is charged for consumption.	Antiquated, cumbersome water rate structure is used, with periodic historic amendments that were poorly documented and implemented; resulting in classes of customers being billed inconsistent charges. The actual composite billing rate likely differs significantly from the published water rate structure, but a lack of auditing leaves the degree of error indeterminate.	Dated, cumbersome water rate structure, not always employed consistently in actual billing operations. The actual composite billing rate is known to differ from the published water rate structure, and a reasonably accurate estimate of the degree of error is determined, allowing a composite billing rate to be quantified.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Straight-forward water rate structure in use, but not updated in several years. Billing operations reliably employ the rate structure. The composite billing rate is derived from a single customer class such as residential customer accounts, neglecting the effect of different rates from varying customer classes.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Clearly written, up-to-date water rate structure is in force and is applied reliably in billing operations. Composite customer rate is determined using a weighted average residential rate using volumes of water in each rate block.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Effective water rate structure is in force and is applied reliably in billing operations. Composite customer rate is determined using a weighted average composite consumption rate, which includes residential, commercial, industrial, institutional (CII), and any other distinct customer classes within the water rate structure.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Current, effective water rate structure is in force and applied reliably in billing operations. The rate structure and calculations of composite rate - which includes residential, commercial, industrial, institutional (CII), and other distinct customer classes - are reviewed by a third party knowledgeable in the M36 methodology at least once every five years.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Customer Retail Unit Cost" component:		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Formalize the process to implement water rates, including a secure documentation procedure. Create a current, formal water rate document and gain approval from all stakeholders.	<u>to qualify for 4:</u> Review the water rate structure and update/formalize as needed. Assess billing operations to ensure that actual billing operations incorporate the established water rate structure.		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Evaluate volume of water used in each usage block by residential users. Multiply volumes by full rate structure.	<u>Launch effort to fully meter the customer population and charge rates based upon water volumes</u>	<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Evaluate volume of water used in each usage block by all classifications of users. Multiply volumes by full rate structure.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Conduct a periodic third-party audit of water used in each usage block by all classifications of users. Multiply volumes by full rate structure.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Keep water rate structure current in addressing the water utility's revenue needs. Update the calculation of the customer unit rate as new rate components, customer classes, or other components are modified.
Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses):	Note: if the water utility purchases/imports its entire water supply, then enter the unit purchase cost of the bulk water supply in the Reporting Worksheet with a grading of 10	Incomplete paper records and lack of documentation on primary operating functions (electric power and treatment costs most importantly) makes calculation of variable production costs a pure guesstimate	Reasonably maintained, but incomplete, paper or electronic accounting provides data to roughly estimate the basic operations costs (pumping power costs and treatment costs) and calculate a unit variable production cost.	Conditions between 2 and 4	Electronic, industry-standard cost accounting system in place. Electric power and treatment costs are reliably tracked and allow accurate weighted calculation of unit variable production costs based on these two inputs and water imported purchase costs (if applicable). All costs are audited internally on a periodic basis.	Conditions between 4 and 6	Reliable electronic, industry-standard cost accounting system in place, with all pertinent water system operating costs tracked. Pertinent additional costs beyond power, treatment and water imported purchase costs (if applicable) such as liability, residuals management, wear and tear on equipment, impending expansion of supply, are included in the unit variable production cost, as applicable. The data is audited at least annually by utility personnel.	Conditions between 6 and 8	Reliable electronic, industry-standard cost accounting system in place, with all pertinent primary and secondary variable production and water imported purchase (if applicable) costs tracked. The data is audited at least annually by utility personnel, and at least once every three years by a third-party knowledgeable in the M36 methodology.	Conditions between 8 and 10	Either of two conditions can be met to obtain a grading of 10: 1) Third party CPA audit of all pertinent primary and secondary variable production and water imported purchase (if applicable) costs on an annual basis, or: 2) Water supply is entirely purchased as bulk imported water, and unit purchase cost serves as the variable production cost.
Improvements to attain higher data grading for "Variable Production Cost" component:		<u>to qualify for 2:</u> Gather available records, institute new procedures to regularly collect and audit basic cost data and most important operations functions.	<u>to qualify for 4:</u> Implement an electronic cost accounting system, structured according to accounting standards for water utilities		<u>to qualify for 6:</u> Formalize process for regular internal audits of production costs. Assess whether additional costs (liability, residuals management, equipment wear, impending infrastructure expansion) should be included to calculate a more representative variable production cost.		<u>to qualify for 8:</u> Formalize the accounting process to include direct cost components (power, treatment) as well as indirect cost components (liability, residuals management, etc.) Arrange to conduct audits by a knowledgeable third-party at least once every three years.		<u>to qualify for 10:</u> Standardize the process to conduct a third-party financial audit by a CPA on an annual basis.		<u>to maintain 10:</u> Maintain program, stay abreast of expenses subject to erratic cost changes and budget/track costs proactively



## AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Customer Service Line Diagrams

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

### Average Length of Customer Service Line

The three figures shown on this worksheet display the assignment of the Average Length of Customer Service Line,  $L_p$ , for the three most common piping configurations.




**Figure 1** shows the configuration of the water meter outside of the customer building next to the curb stop valve. In this configuration  $L_p = 0$  since the distance between the curb stop and the customer metering point is essentially zero.

**Figure 2** shows the configuration of the customer water meter located inside the customer building, where  $L_p$  is the distance from the curb stop to the water meter.

**Figure 3** shows the configuration of an unmetered customer building, where  $L_p$  is the distance from the curb stop to the first point of customer water consumption, or, more simply, the building line.

In any water system the  $L_p$  will vary notably in a community of different structures, therefore the average  $L_p$  value is used and this should be approximated or calculated if a sample of service line measurements has been gathered.

[Click for more information](#)





## AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Definitions

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

Item Name	Description
<b>Apparent Losses</b> <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>= unauthorized consumption + customer metering inaccuracies + systematic data handling errors</p> <p>Apparent Losses include all types of inaccuracies associated with customer metering (worn meters as well as improperly sized meters or wrong type of meter for the water usage profile) as well as systematic data handling errors (meter reading, billing, archiving and reporting), plus unauthorized consumption (theft or illegal use).</p> <p>NOTE: Over-estimation of Apparent Losses results in under-estimation of Real Losses. Under-estimation of Apparent Losses results in over-estimation of Real Losses.</p>
<b>AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION</b> <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>= billed water exported + billed metered + billed unmetered + unbilled metered + unbilled unmetered consumption</p> <p>The volume of metered and/or unmetered water taken by registered customers, the water utility's own uses, and uses of others who are implicitly or explicitly authorized to do so by the water utility; for residential, commercial, industrial and public-minded purposes.</p> <p>Typical retail customers' consumption is tabulated usually from established customer accounts as billed metered consumption, or - for unmetered customers - billed unmetered consumption. These types of consumption, along with billed water exported, provide revenue potential for the water utility. <b>Be certain to tabulate the water exported volume as a separate component and do not "double-count" it by including in the billed metered consumption component as well as the water exported component.</b></p> <p>Unbilled authorized consumption occurs typically in non-account uses, including water for fire fighting and training, flushing of water mains and sewers, street cleaning, watering of municipal gardens, public fountains, or similar public-minded uses. Occasionally these uses may be metered and billed (or charged a flat fee), but usually they are unmetered and unbilled. In the latter case, the water auditor may use a default value to estimate this quantity, or implement procedures for the reliable quantification of these uses. This starts with documenting usage events as they occur and estimating the amount of water used in each event. (See Unbilled unmetered consumption)</p>
<a href="#">View Service Connection Diagram</a> <b>Average length of customer service line</b> <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>This is the average length of customer service line, Lp, that is owned and maintained by the customer; from the point of ownership transfer to the customer water meter, or building line (if unmetered). The quantity is one of the data inputs for the calculation of Unavoidable Annual Real Losses (UARL), which serves as the denominator of the performance indicator: Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI). The value of Lp is multiplied by the number of customer service connections to obtain a total length of customer owned piping in the system. The purpose of this parameter is to account for the unmetered service line infrastructure that is the responsibility of the customer for arranging repairs of leaks that occur on their lines. In many cases leak repairs arranged by customers take longer to be executed than leak repairs arranged by the water utility on utility-maintained piping. Leaks run longer - and lose more water - on customer-owned service piping, than utility owned piping.</p> <p>If the customer water meter exists near the ownership transfer point (usually the curb stop located between the water main and the customer premises) this distance is zero because the meter and transfer point are the same. This is the often encountered configuration of customer water meters located in an underground meter box or "pit" outside of the customer's building. The Free Water Audit Software asks a "Yes/No" question about the meter at this location. If the auditor selects "Yes" then this distance is set to zero and the data grading score for this component is set to 10.</p> <p>If water meters are typically located inside the customer premise/building, or properties are unmetered, it is up to the water auditor to estimate a system-wide average Lp length based upon the various customer land parcel sizes and building locations in the service area. Lp will be a shorter length in areas of high density housing, and a longer length in areas of low density housing and varied commercial and industrial buildings. General parcel demographics should be employed to obtain a composite average Lp length for the entire system.</p> <p>Refer to the "Service Connection Diagram" worksheet for a depiction of the service line/metering configurations that typically exist in water utilities. This worksheet gives guidance on the determination of the Average Length, Lp, for each configuration.</p>
<b>Average operating pressure</b> <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>This is the average pressure in the distribution system that is the subject of the water audit. Many water utilities have a calibrated hydraulic model of their water distribution system. For these utilities, the hydraulic model can be utilized to obtain a very accurate quantity of average pressure. In the absence of a hydraulic model, the average pressure may be approximated by obtaining readings of static water pressure from a representative sample of fire hydrants or other system access points evenly located across the system. A weighted average of the pressure can be assembled; but be sure to take into account the elevation of the fire hydrants, which typically exist several feet higher than the level of buried water pipelines. If the water utility is compiling the water audit for the first time, the average pressure can be approximated, but with a low data grading. In subsequent years of auditing, effort should be made to improve the accuracy of the average pressure quantity. This will then qualify the value for a higher data grading.</p>
<b>Billed Authorized Consumption</b>	<p>All consumption that is billed and authorized by the utility. This may include both metered and unmetered consumption. See "Authorized Consumption" for more information.</p>
<b>Billed metered consumption</b> <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>All metered consumption which is billed to retail customers, including all groups of customers such as domestic, commercial, industrial or institutional. <b>It does NOT include water supplied to neighboring utilities (water exported) which is metered and billed. Be sure to subtract any consumption for exported water sales that may be included in these billing roles. Water supplied as exports to neighboring water utilities should be included only in the Water Exported component.</b> The metered consumption data can be taken directly from billing records for the water audit period. The accuracy of yearly metered consumption data can be refined by including an adjustment to account for customer meter reading lag time since not all customer meters are read on the same day of the meter reading period. However additional analysis is necessary to determine the lag time adjustment value, which may or may not be significant.</p>
<b>Billed unmetered consumption</b> <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>All billed consumption which is calculated based on estimates or norms from water usage sites that have been determined <u>by utility policy</u> to be left unmetered. This is typically a very small component in systems that maintain a policy to meter their customer population. However, this quantity can be the key consumption component in utilities that have not adopted a universal metering policy. <b>This component should NOT include any water that is supplied to neighboring utilities (water exported) which is unmetered but billed. Water supplied as exports to neighboring water utilities should be included only in the Water Exported component.</b></p>



Item Name	Description
<b>Customer metering inaccuracies</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>Apparent water losses caused by the collective under-registration of customer water meters. Many customer water meters gradually wear as large cumulative volumes of water are passed through them over time. This causes the meters to under-register the flow of water. This occurrence is common with smaller residential meters of sizes 5/8-inch and 3/4 inch after they have registered very large cumulative volumes of water, which generally occurs only after periods of years. For meters sized 1-inch and larger - typical of multi-unit residential, commercial and industrial accounts - meter under-registration can occur from wear or from the improper application of the meter; i.e. installing the wrong type of meter or the wrong size of meter, for the flow pattern (profile) of the consumer. For instance, many larger meters have reduced accuracy at low flows. If an oversized meter is installed, most of the time the routine flow will occur in the low flow range of the meter, and a significant portion of it may not be registered. It is important to properly select and install all meters, but particularly large customer meters, size 1-inch and larger.</p> <p>The auditor has two options for entering data for this component of the audit. The auditor can enter a percentage under-registration (typically an estimated value), this will apply the selected percentage to the two categories of metered consumption to determine the volume of water not recorded due to customer meter inaccuracy. Note that this percentage is a composite average inaccuracy for <u>all</u> customer meters in the entire meter population. The percentage will be multiplied by the sum of the volumes in the Billed Metered and Unbilled Metered components. Alternatively, if the auditor has substantial data from meter testing activities, he or she can calculate their own loss volumes, and this volume may be entered directly.</p> <p>Note that a value of zero will be accepted but an alert will appear asking if the customer population is unmetered. Since all metered systems have some degree of inaccuracy, a positive value should be entered. A value of zero in this component is valid only if the water utility does not meter its customer population.</p>
<b>Customer retail unit cost</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>The Customer Retail Unit Cost represents the charge that customers pay for water service. This unit cost is applied routinely to the components of Apparent Loss, since these losses represent water reaching customers but not (fully) paid for. Since most water utilities have a rate structure that includes a variety of different costs based upon class of customer, a weighted average of individual costs and number of customer accounts in each class can be calculated to determine a single composite cost that should be entered into this cell. Finally, the weighted average cost should also include additional charges for sewer, storm water or biosolids processing, <u>but only if</u> these charges are based upon the volume of potable water consumed.</p> <p>For water utilities in regions with limited water resources and a questionable ability to meet the drinking water demands in the future, the Customer Retail Unit Cost might also be applied to value the Real Losses; instead of applying the Variable Production Cost to Real Losses. In this way, it is assumed that every unit volume of leakage reduced by leakage management activities will be sold to a customer.</p> <p>Note: the Free Water Audit Software allows the user to select the units that are charged to customers (either \$/1,000 gallons, \$/hundred cubic feet, or \$/1,000 litres) and automatically converts these units to the units that appear in the "WATER SUPPLIED" box. The monetary units are United States dollars, \$.</p>
<b>Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI)</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>The ratio of the Current Annual Real Losses (Real Losses) to the Unavoidable Annual Real Losses (UARL). The ILI is a highly effective performance indicator for comparing (benchmarking) the performance of utilities in operational management of real losses.</p>
<b>Length of mains</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>Length of all pipelines (except service connections) in the system starting from the point of system input metering (for example at the outlet of the treatment plant). It is also recommended to include in this measure the total length of fire hydrant lead pipe. Hydrant lead pipe is the pipe branching from the water main to the fire hydrant. Fire hydrant leads are typically of a sufficiently large size that is more representative of a pipeline than a service connection. The average length of hydrant leads across the entire system can be assumed if not known, and multiplied by the number of fire hydrants in the system, which can also be assumed if not known. This value can then be added to the total pipeline length. Total length of mains can therefore be calculated as:</p> <p>Length of Mains, miles = (total pipeline length, miles) + [ {(average fire hydrant lead length, ft) x (number of fire hydrants)} / 5,280 ft/mile ] or Length of Mains, kilometres = (total pipeline length, kilometres) + [ {(average fire hydrant lead length, metres) x (number of fire hydrants)} / 1,000 metres/kilometre ]</p>
<b>NON-REVENUE WATER</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>= Apparent Losses + Real Losses + Unbilled Metered Consumption + Unbilled Unmetered Consumption. This is water which does not provide revenue potential to the utility.</p>
<b>Number of <u>active</u> AND <u>inactive</u> service connections</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>Number of customer service connections, extending from the water main to supply water to a customer. Please note that this includes the actual number of distinct piping connections, including fire connections, whether active or inactive. This may differ substantially from the number of customers (or number of accounts). <b>Note: this number does not include the pipeline leads to fire hydrants - the total length of piping supplying fire hydrants should be included in the "Length of mains" parameter.</b></p>
<b>Real Losses</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>Physical water losses from the pressurized system (water mains and customer service connections) and the utility's storage tanks, up to the point of customer consumption. In metered systems this is the customer meter, in unmetered situations this is the first point of consumption (stop tap/tap) within the property. The annual volume lost through all types of leaks, breaks and overflows depends on frequencies, flow rates, and average duration of individual leaks, breaks and overflows.</p>
<b>Revenue Water</b>	<p>Those components of System Input Volume that are billed and have the potential to produce revenue.</p>
<b>Service Connection Density</b>  <a href="#">Find</a>	<p>=number of customer service connections / length of mains</p>

Item Name	Description
<b>Systematic data handling errors</b>  <div>Find</div>	<p>Apparent losses caused by accounting omissions, errant computer programming, gaps in policy, procedure, and permitting/activation of new accounts; and any type of data lapse that results in under-stated customer water consumption in summary billing reports.</p> <p><b>Systematic Data Handling Errors result in a direct loss of revenue potential. Water utilities can find "lost" revenue by keying on this component.</b></p> <p>Utilities typically measure water consumption registered by water meters at customer premises. The meter should be read routinely (ex: monthly) and the data transferred to the Customer Billing System, which generates and sends a bill to the customer. <u>Data Transfer Errors</u> result in the consumption value being less than the actual consumption, creating an apparent loss. Such error might occur from illegible and mis-recorded hand-written readings compiled by meter readers, inputting an incorrect meter register unit conversion factor in the automatic meter reading equipment, or a variety of similar errors.</p> <p>Apparent losses also occur from <u>Data Analysis Errors</u> in the archival and data reporting processes of the Customer Billing System. Inaccurate estimates used for accounts that fail to produce a meter reading are a common source of error. Billing adjustments may award customers a rightful monetary credit, but do so by creating a negative value of consumption, thus under-stating the actual consumption. Account activation lapses may allow new buildings to use water for months without meter readings and billing. Poor permitting and construction inspection practices can result in a new building lacking a billing account, a water meter and meter reading; i.e., the customer is unknown to the utility's billing system.</p> <p>Close auditing of the permitting, metering, meter reading, billing and reporting processes of the water consumption data trail can uncover data management gaps that create volumes of systematic data handling error. Utilities should routinely analyze customer billing records to detect data anomalies and quantify these losses. For example, a billing account that registers zero consumption for two or more billing cycles should be checked to explain why usage has seemingly halted. Given the revenue loss impacts of these losses, water utilities are well-justified in providing continuous oversight and timely correction of data transfer errors &amp; data handling errors.</p> <p>If the water auditor has not yet gathered detailed data or assessment of systematic data handling error, it is recommended that the auditor apply the default value of 0.25% of the the Billed Authorized Consumption volume. However, if the auditor <u>has</u> investigated the billing system and its controls, and <u>has</u> well validated data that indicates the volume from systematic data handling error is substantially higher or lower than that generated by the default value, then the auditor should enter a quantity that was derived from the utility investigations and select an appropriate grading. <u>Note:</u> negative values are not allowed for this audit component. If the auditor enters zero for this component then a grading of 1 will be automatically assigned.</p>
<b>Total annual cost of operating the water system</b>  <div>Find</div>	<p>These costs include those for operations, maintenance and any annually incurred costs for long-term upkeep of the drinking water supply and distribution system. It should include the costs of day-to-day upkeep and long-term financing such as repayment of capital bonds for infrastructure expansion or improvement. Typical costs include employee salaries and benefits, materials, equipment, insurance, fees, administrative costs and all other costs that exist to sustain the drinking water supply. Depending upon water utility accounting procedures or regulatory agency requirements, it may be appropriate to include depreciation in the total of this cost. This cost should not include any costs to operate wastewater, biosolids or other systems outside of drinking water.</p>
<b>Unauthorized consumption</b>  <div>Find</div>	<p>Includes water illegally withdrawn from fire hydrants, illegal connections, bypasses to customer consumption meters, or tampering with metering or meter reading equipment; as well as any other ways to receive water while thwarting the water utility's ability to collect revenue for the water. Unauthorized consumption results in uncaptured revenue and creates an error that understates customer consumption. In most water utilities this volume is low and, if the water auditor has not yet gathered detailed data for these loss occurrences, it is recommended that the auditor apply a default value of 0.25% of the volume of water supplied. However, if the auditor has investigated unauthorized occurrences, and has well validated data that indicates the volume from unauthorized consumption is substantially higher or lower than that generated by the default value, then the auditor should enter a quantity that was derived from the utility investigations. Note that a value of zero will not be accepted since all water utilities have some volume of unauthorized consumption occurring in their system.</p> <p>Note: if the auditor selects the default value for unauthorized consumption, a data grading of 5 is automatically assigned, but not displayed on the Reporting Worksheet.</p>
<b>Unavoidable Annual Real Losses (UARL)</b>  <div>Find</div>	<p>UARL (gallons/day)=(5.41Lm + 0.15Nc + 7.5Lc) xP, or UARL (litres/day)=(18.0Lm + 0.8Nc + 25.0Lc) xP</p> <p>where: Lm = length of mains (miles or kilometres) Nc = number of customer service connections Lp = the average distance of customer service connection piping (feet or metres) (see the Worksheet "Service Connection Diagram" for guidance on deterring the value of Lp) Lc = total length of customer service connection piping (miles or km) Lc = Nc X Lp (miles or kilometres) P = Pressure (psi or metres)</p> <p>The UARL is a theoretical reference value representing the technical low limit of leakage that could be achieved if all of today's best technology could be successfully applied. It is a key variable in the calculation of the Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI). Striving to reduce system leakage to a level close to the UARL is usually not needed unless the water supply is unusually expensive, scarce or both.</p> <p>NOTE: The UARL calculation has not yet been proven as fully valid for very small, or low pressure water distribution systems. If, <u>in gallons per day:</u> (Lm x 32) + Nc &lt; 3000 or P &lt; 35psi <u>in litres per day:</u> (Lm x 20) + Nc &lt; 3000 or P &lt; 25m then the calculated UARL value may not be valid. The software does not display a value of UARL or ILI if either of these conditions is true.</p>

Item Name	Description
<div>Unbilled Authorized Consumption</div>	All consumption that is unbilled, but still authorized by the utility. This includes Unbilled Metered Consumption + Unbilled Unmetered Consumption. See "Authorized Consumption" for more information. For Unbilled Unmetered Consumption, the Free Water Audit Software provides the auditor the option to select a default value if they have not audited unmetered activities in detail. The default calculates a volume that is 1.25% of the Water Supplied volume. If the auditor has carefully audited the various unbilled, unmetered, authorized uses of water, and has established reliable estimates of this collective volume, then he or she may enter the volume directly for this component, and not use the default value.
<div>Unbilled metered consumption</div> <div>Find</div>	Metered consumption which is authorized by the water utility, but, for any reason, is <u>deemed by utility policy</u> to be unbilled. This might for example include metered water consumed by the utility itself in treatment or distribution operations, or metered water provided to civic institutions free of charge. <b>It does <u>not</u> include water supplied to neighboring utilities (water exported) which may be metered but not billed.</b>
<div>Unbilled unmetered consumption</div> <div>Find</div>	<p>Any kind of Authorized Consumption which is neither billed or metered. This component typically includes water used in activities such as fire fighting, flushing of water mains and sewers, street cleaning, fire flow tests conducted by the water utility, etc. In most water utilities it is a small component which is very often substantially overestimated. <b>It does NOT include water supplied to neighboring utilities (water exported) which is unmetered and unbilled – an unlikely case.</b> This component has many sub-components of water use which are often tedious to identify and quantify. Because of this, and the fact that it is usually a small portion of the water supplied, it is recommended that the auditor apply the default value, which is 1.25% of the Water Supplied volume. Select the default percentage to enter this value.</p> <p>If the water utility <u>has</u> carefully audited the unbilled, unmetered activities occurring in the system, and has well validated data that gives a value substantially higher or lower than the default volume, then the auditor should enter their own volume. However the default approach is recommended for most water utilities.</p> <p>Note that a value of zero is not permitted, since all water utilities have some volume of water in this component occurring in their system.</p>
<div>Units and Conversions</div>	<p>The user may develop an audit based on one of three unit selections:</p> <div>1) Million Gallons (US)</div> <div>2) Megalitres (Thousand Cubic Metres)</div> <div>3) Acre-feet</div> <p>Once this selection has been made in the instructions sheet, all calculations are made on the basis of the chosen units. Should the user wish to make additional conversions, a unit converter is provided below (use drop down menus to select units from the yellow unit boxes):</p> <div><div>Enter Units:</div><div>Convert From...</div><div>Converts to.....</div><div>1</div><div>Million Gallons (US)</div><div>=</div><div>3.06888329</div><div>Acre-feet</div><div>(conversion factor = 3.06888328973723)</div></div>
<div>Use of Option Buttons</div>	<div><div>To use the default percent value choose this button</div><div>To enter a value choose this button and enter the value in the cell to the right</div><div><div>Pcnt:</div><div>Value:</div><div>1.25%</div><div><div></div><div></div></div></div></div> <p><b>NOTE:</b> For Unbilled Unmetered Consumption, Unauthorized Consumption and Systematic Data Handling Errors, a recommended default value can be applied by selecting the Percent option. The default values are based on fixed percentages of Water Supplied or Billed Authorized Consumption and are recommended for use in this audit unless the auditor has well validated data for their system. Default values are shown by purple cells, as shown in the example above.</p> <p>If a default value is selected, the user does not need to grade the item; a grading value of 5 is automatically applied (however, this grade will not be displayed).</p>
<div>Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses)</div> <div>Find</div>	<p>The cost to produce and supply the next unit of water (e.g., \$/million gallons). This cost is determined by calculating the summed unit costs for ground and surface water treatment and all power used for pumping from the source to the customer. It may also include other miscellaneous unit costs that apply to the production of drinking water. It should also include the unit cost of bulk water purchased as an import if applicable.</p> <p>It is common to apply this unit cost to the volume of Real Losses. However, if water resources are strained and the ability to meet future drinking water demands is in question, then the water auditor can be justified in applying the Customer Retail Rate to the Real Loss volume, rather than applying the Variable Production Cost.</p> <p>The Free Water Audit Software applies the Variable Production costs to Real Losses by default. However, the auditor has the option on the Reporting Worksheet to select the Customer Retail Cost as the basis for the Real Loss cost evaluation if the auditor determines that this is warranted.</p>
<div>Volume from own sources</div> <div>Find</div>	<p>The volume of water withdrawn (abstracted) from water resources (rivers, lakes, streams, wells, etc) controlled by the water utility, and then treated for potable water distribution. Most water audits are compiled for utility retail water distribution systems, so this volume should reflect the amount of <u>treated</u> drinking water that entered the distribution system. Often the volume of water measured at the effluent of the treatment works is slightly less than the volume measured at the raw water source, since some of the water is used in the treatment process. Thus, it is useful if flows are metered at the effluent of the treatment works. If metering exists only at the raw water source, an adjustment for water used in the treatment process should be included to account for water consumed in treatment operations such as filter backwashing, basin flushing and cleaning, etc. If the audit is conducted for a wholesale water agency that sells untreated water, then this quantity reflects the measure of the raw water, typically metered at the source.</p>



Item Name	Description
<b>Volume from own sources: Master meter and supply error adjustment</b> <input type="button" value="Find"/>	<p>An estimate or measure of the degree of inaccuracy that exists in the master (production) meters measuring the annual Volume from own Sources, and any error in the data trail that exists to collect, store and report the summary production data. This adjustment is a weighted average number that represents the collective error for all master meters for all days of the audit year and any errors identified in the data trail. Meter error can occur in different ways. A meter or meters may be inaccurate by under-registering flow (did not capture all the flow), or by over-registering flow (overstated the actual flow). Data error can occur due to data gaps caused by temporary outages of the meter or related instrumentation. All water utilities encounter some degree of inaccuracy in master meters and data errors in archival systems are common; thus a value of zero should <u>not</u> be entered. Enter a negative percentage or value for metered data under-registration; or, enter a positive percentage or value for metered data over-registration.</p>
<b>Water exported</b> <input type="button" value="Find"/>	<p>The Water Exported volume is the bulk water conveyed and sold by the water utility to neighboring water systems that exists outside of their service area. Typically this water is metered at the custody transfer point of interconnection between the two water utilities. Usually the meter(s) are owned by the water utility that is selling the water: i.e. the exporter. If the water utility who is compiling the annual water audit sells bulk water in this manner, they are an exporter of water.</p> <p>Note: The Water Exported volume is sold to wholesale customers who are typically charged a wholesale rate that is different than retail rates charged to the retail customers existing within the service area. Many state regulatory agencies require that the Water Exported volume be reported to them as a quantity separate and distinct from the retail customer billed consumption. For these reasons - and others - the Water Exported volume is always quantified separately from Billed Authorized Consumption in the standard water audit. <b>Be certain not to "double-count" this quantity by including it in both the Water Exported box and the Billed Metered Consumption box of the water audit Reporting Worksheet. This volume should be included only in the Water Exported box.</b></p>
<b>Water exported: Master meter and supply error adjustment</b> <input type="button" value="Find"/>	<p>An estimate or measure of the volume in which the Water Exported volume is incorrect. This adjustment is a weighted average that represents the collective error for all of the metered and archived exported flow for all days of the audit year. Meter error can occur in different ways. A meter may be inaccurate by under-registering flow (did not capture all the flow), or by over-registering flow (overstated the actual flow). Error in the metered, archived data can also occur due to data gaps caused by temporary outages of the meter or related instrumentation. All water utilities encounter some degree of error in their metered data, particularly if meters are aged and infrequently tested. Occasional errors also occur in the archived data. Thus, a value of zero should <u>not</u> be entered. Enter a negative percentage or value for metered data under-registration; or enter a positive percentage or value for metered data over-registration. If regular meter accuracy testing is conducted on the meter(s) - which is usually conducted by the water utility selling the water - then the results of this testing can be used to help quantify the meter error adjustment. Corrections to data gaps or other errors found in the archived data should also be included as a portion of this meter error adjustment.</p>
<b>Water imported</b> <input type="button" value="Find"/>	<p>The Water Imported volume is the bulk water purchased to become part of the Water Supplied volume. Typically this is water purchased from a neighboring water utility or regional water authority, and is metered at the custody transfer point of interconnection between the two water utilities. Usually the meter(s) are owned by the water supplier selling the water to the utility conducting the water audit. The water supplier selling the bulk water usually charges the receiving utility based upon a wholesale water rate.</p>
<b>Water imported: Master meter and supply error adjustment</b> <input type="button" value="Find"/>	<p>An estimate or measure of the volume in which the Water Imported volume is incorrect. This adjustment is a weighted average that represents the collective error for all of the metered and archived imported flow for all days of the audit year. Meter error can occur in different ways. A meter may be inaccurate by under-registering flow (did not capture all the flow), or by over-registering flow (overstated the actual flow). Error in the metered, archived data can also occur due to data gaps caused by temporary outages of the meter or related instrumentation. All water utilities encounter some level of meter inaccuracy, particularly if meters are aged and infrequently tested. Occasional errors also occur in the archived metered data. Thus, a value of zero should <u>not</u> be entered. Enter a negative percentage or value for metered data under-registration; or, enter a positive percentage or value for metered data over-registration. If regular meter accuracy testing is conducted on the meter(s) - which is usually conducted by the water utility selling the water - then the results of this testing can be used to help quantify the meter error adjustment.</p>
<b>WATER LOSSES</b> <input type="button" value="Find"/>	<p>= apparent losses + real losses</p> <p>Water Losses are the difference between Water Supplied and Authorized Consumption. Water losses can be considered as a total volume for the whole system, or for partial systems such as transmission systems, pressure zones or district metered areas (DMA); if one of these configurations are the basis of the water audit.</p>



# AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Determining Water Loss Standing

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association.  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved.

Water Audit Report for: City of Sacramento Department of Utilities (3410020)

Reporting Year: 2020 7/2019 - 6/2020

Data Validity Score: 66

## Water Loss Control Planning Guide

Functional Focus Area	Water Audit Data Validity Level / Score				
	Level I (0-25)	Level II (26-50)	Level III (51-70)	Level IV (71-90)	Level V (91-100)
Audit Data Collection	Launch auditing and loss control team; address production metering deficiencies	Analyze business process for customer metering and billing functions and water supply operations. Identify data gaps.	Establish/revise policies and procedures for data collection	Refine data collection practices and establish as routine business process	Annual water audit is a reliable gauge of year-to-year water efficiency standing
Short-term loss control	Research information on leak detection programs. Begin flowcharting analysis of customer billing system	Conduct loss assessment investigations on a sample portion of the system: customer meter testing, leak survey, unauthorized consumption, etc.	Establish ongoing mechanisms for customer meter accuracy testing, active leakage control and infrastructure monitoring	Refine, enhance or expand ongoing programs based upon economic justification	Stay abreast of improvements in metering, meter reading, billing, leakage management and infrastructure rehabilitation
Long-term loss control		Begin to assess long-term needs requiring large expenditure: customer meter replacement, water main replacement program, new customer billing system or Automatic Meter Reading (AMR) system.	Begin to assemble economic business case for long-term needs based upon improved data becoming available through the water audit process.	Conduct detailed planning, budgeting and launch of comprehensive improvements for metering, billing or infrastructure management	Continue incremental improvements in short-term and long-term loss control interventions
Target-setting			Establish long-term apparent and real loss reduction goals (+10 year horizon)	Establish mid-range (5 year horizon) apparent and real loss reduction goals	Evaluate and refine loss control goals on a yearly basis
Benchmarking			Preliminary Comparisons - can begin to rely upon the Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) for performance comparisons for real losses (see below table)	Performance Benchmarking - ILI is meaningful in comparing real loss standing	Identify Best Practices/ Best in class - the ILI is very reliable as a real loss performance indicator for best in class service

*For validity scores of 50 or below, the shaded blocks should not be focus areas until better data validity is achieved.*

Once data have been entered into the Reporting Worksheet, the performance indicators are automatically calculated. How does a water utility operator know how well his or her system is performing? The AWWA Water Loss Control Committee provided the following table to assist water utilities in gauging an approximate Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) that is appropriate for their water system and local conditions. The lower the amount of leakage and real losses that exist in the system, then the lower the ILI value will be.

**Note:** this table offers an approximate guideline for leakage reduction target-setting. The best means of setting such targets include performing an economic assessment of various loss control methods. However, this table is useful if such an assessment is not possible.

**General Guidelines for Setting a Target ILI  
(without doing a full economic analysis of leakage control options)**


Target ILI Range	Financial Considerations	Operational Considerations	Water Resources Considerations
<b>1.0 - 3.0</b>	Water resources are costly to develop or purchase; ability to increase revenues via water rates is greatly limited because of regulation or low ratepayer affordability.	Operating with system leakage above this level would require expansion of existing infrastructure and/or additional water resources to meet the demand.	Available resources are greatly limited and are very difficult and/or environmentally unsound to develop.
<b>&gt;3.0 -5.0</b>	Water resources can be developed or purchased at reasonable expense; periodic water rate increases can be feasibly imposed and are tolerated by the customer population.	Existing water supply infrastructure capability is sufficient to meet long-term demand as long as reasonable leakage management controls are in place.	Water resources are believed to be sufficient to meet long-term needs, but demand management interventions (leakage management, water conservation) are included in the long-term
<b>&gt;5.0 - 8.0</b>	Cost to purchase or obtain/treat water is low, as are rates charged to customers.	Superior reliability, capacity and integrity of the water supply infrastructure make it relatively immune to supply shortages.	Water resources are plentiful, reliable, and easily extracted.
<b>Greater than 8.0</b>	Although operational and financial considerations may allow a long-term ILI greater than 8.0, such a level of leakage is not an effective utilization of water as a resource. Setting a target level greater than 8.0 - other than as an incremental goal to a smaller long-term target - is discouraged.		
<b>Less than 1.0</b>	If the calculated Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) value for your system is 1.0 or less, two possibilities exist. a) you are maintaining your leakage at low levels in a class with the top worldwide performers in leakage control. b) A portion of your data may be flawed, causing your losses to be greatly understated. This is likely if you calculate a low ILI value but do not employ extensive leakage control practices in your operations. In such cases it is beneficial to validate the data by performing field measurements to confirm the accuracy of production and customer meters, or to identify any other potential sources of error in the data.		

Example 1a: Million Gallons:

Example 1b: Million Gallons:  
Performance Indicators

Example 2a: Megalitres:  
Reporting Worksheet

Example 2b: Megalitres:  
Reporting Worksheet



Example Audit 1a:

AWWA Free Water Audit Software:  
Reporting Worksheet

WAS v5.0  
American Water Works Association  
Copyright © 2014, All Rights Reserved

?

 Click to access definition

+

 Click to add a comment

Water Audit Report for:

City of Asheville (01-11-010)

Reporting Year:

2013

7/2012 - 6/2013

Please enter data in the white cells below. Where available, metered values should be used; if metered values are unavailable please estimate a value. Indicate your confidence in the accuracy of the input data by grading each component (n/a or 1-10) using the drop-down list to the left of the input cell. Hover the mouse over the cell to obtain a description of the grades

All volumes to be entered as: **MILLION GALLONS (US) PER YEAR**

WATER SUPPLIED

Volume from own sources:

+

?

7

7,352.880

MG/Yr

Water imported:

+

?

n/a

0.000

MG/Yr

Water exported:

+

?

n/a

0.000

MG/Yr

WATER SUPPLIED:

7,067.430

MG/Yr

AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION

Billed metered:

+

?

8

4,782.250

MG/Yr

Billed unmetered:

+

?

n/a

0.000

MG/Yr

Unbilled metered:

+

?

7

27.757

MG/Yr

Unbilled unmetered:

+

?

8

157.790

MG/Yr

Unbilled Unmetered volume entered is greater than the recommended default value

AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION:

?

4,967.797

MG/Yr

WATER LOSSES (Water Supplied - Authorized Consumption)

2,099.633

MG/Yr

Apparent Losses

Unauthorized consumption:

+

?

17.669

MG/Yr

Default option selected for unauthorized consumption - a grading of 5 is applied but not displayed

Customer metering inaccuracies:

+

?

7

111.220

MG/Yr

Systematic data handling errors:

+

?

5

11.956

MG/Yr

Default option selected for Systematic data handling errors - a grading of 5 is applied but not displayed

Apparent Losses:

?

140.844

MG/Yr

Real Losses (Current Annual Real Losses or CARL)

Real Losses = Water Losses - Apparent Losses:

?

1,958.789

MG/Yr

WATER LOSSES:

2,099.633

MG/Yr

NON-REVENUE WATER

NON-REVENUE WATER:

?

2,285.180

MG/Yr

= Water Losses + Unbilled Metered + Unbilled Unmetered

SYSTEM DATA

Length of mains:

+

?

4

1,236.5

miles

Number of active AND inactive service connections:

+

?

7

55,256

Service connection density:

?

45

conn./mile main

Are customer meters typically located at the curbstop or property line?

Yes

(length of service line, beyond the property boundary, that is the responsibility of the utility)

Average length of customer service line has been set to zero and a data grading score of 10 has been applied

Average operating pressure:

+

?

4

145.3

psi

COST DATA

Total annual cost of operating water system:

+

?

10

\$33,630,676

\$/Year

Customer retail unit cost (applied to Apparent Losses):

+

?

10

\$3.22

\$/100 cubic feet (ccf)

Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses):

+

?

6

\$335.94

\$/Million gallons

Use Customer Retail Unit Cost to value real losses

WATER AUDIT DATA VALIDITY SCORE:

\*\*\* YOUR SCORE IS: 72 out of 100 \*\*\*

A weighted scale for the components of consumption and water loss is included in the calculation of the Water Audit Data Validity Score

PRIORITY AREAS FOR ATTENTION:

Based on the information provided, audit accuracy can be improved by addressing the following components:

1: Volume from own sources

2: Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses)

3: Unauthorized consumption

AWWA Free Water Audit Software v5.0

Example Audits 24



## Example Audit 1b:

### AWWA Free Water Audit Software: System Attributes and Performance Indicators

WAS v5.0  
American Water Works Association  
Copyright ©2014. All Rights Reserved

Water Audit Report for: **City of Asheville (01-11-010)**

Reporting Year: **2013** **7/2012 - 6/2013**

\*\*\* YOUR WATER AUDIT DATA VALIDITY SCORE IS: 72 out of 100 \*\*\*

#### System Attributes:

Apparent Losses:	140.844	MG/Yr	
+	Real Losses:	1,958.789	MG/Yr
=	<b>Water Losses:</b>	<b>2,099.633</b>	MG/Yr

? Unavoidable Annual Real Losses (UARL): 794.34 MG/Yr

Annual cost of Apparent Losses: \$606,265

Annual cost of Real Losses: \$658,036

Valued at **Variable Production Cost**

[Return to Reporting Worksheet to change this assumption](#)

#### Performance Indicators:

##### Financial:

Non-revenue water as percent by volume of Water Supplied:	32.3%	
Non-revenue water as percent by cost of operating system:	3.9%	Real Losses valued at Variable Production Cost

##### Operational Efficiency:

Apparent Losses per service connection per day:	6.98	gallons/connection/day
Real Losses per service connection per day:	97.12	gallons/connection/day
Real Losses per length of main per day*:	N/A	
Real Losses per service connection per day per psi pressure:	0.67	gallons/connection/day/psi

From Above, Real Losses = Current Annual Real Losses (CARL): 1,958.79 million gallons/year

? Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) [CARL/UARL]: 2.47

\* This performance indicator applies for systems with a low service connection density of less than 32 service connections/mile of pipeline





## Example Audit 2a:

### AWWA Free Water Audit Software: Reporting Worksheet

WAS v5.0  
American Water Works Association  
Copyright ©2014. All Rights Reserved

[Click to access definition](#)  
[Click to add a comment](#)

Water Audit Report for: **The City of Calgary**  
Reporting Year: **2013** 1/2013 - 12/2013

Please enter data in the white cells below. Where available, metered values should be used; if metered values are unavailable please estimate a value. Indicate your confidence in the accuracy of the input data by grading each component (n/a or 1-10) using the drop-down list to the left of the input cell. Hover the mouse over the cell to obtain a description of the grades

All volumes to be entered as: **MEGALITRES (THOUSAND CUBIC METRES) PER YEAR**

To select the correct data grading for each input, determine the highest grade where the utility meets or exceeds all criteria for that grade and all grades below it.

#### WATER SUPPLIED

Volume from own sources:  7  174,324.000 ML/Yr  
Water imported:  n/a  0.000 ML/Yr  
Water exported:  7  8,190.131 ML/Yr

#### Master Meter Error Adjustments

Pcnt:  7  1.00%   ML/Yr  
Value:   ML/Yr  
Pcnt:  7  1.00%   ML/Yr  
Value:   ML/Yr

Enter negative % or value for under-registration  
Enter positive % or value for over-registration

**WATER SUPPLIED:**  **164,488.979** ML/Yr

#### AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION

Billed metered:  6  125,111.268 ML/Yr  
Billed unmetered:  8  3,503.386 ML/Yr  
Unbilled metered:  7  166.157 ML/Yr  
Unbilled unmetered:  6  1,444.000 ML/Yr

Click here:    
for help using option  
buttons below

Pcnt:   Value:  1,444.000 ML/Yr

Use buttons to select  
percentage of water  
supplied  
OR  
value

**AUTHORIZED CONSUMPTION:**  **130,224.811** ML/Yr

#### WATER LOSSES (Water Supplied - Authorized Consumption)

**34,264.168** ML/Yr

#### Apparent Losses

Unauthorized consumption:   411.222 ML/Yr

Default option selected for unauthorized consumption - a grading of 5 is applied but not displayed

Customer metering inaccuracies:  6  1,265.429 ML/Yr  
Systematic data handling errors:   312.778 ML/Yr

Default option selected for Systematic data handling errors - a grading of 5 is applied but not displayed

**Apparent Losses:**  **1,989.429** ML/Yr

#### Real Losses (Current Annual Real Losses or CARL)

Real Losses = Water Losses - Apparent Losses:  **32,274.739** ML/Yr

**WATER LOSSES:**  **34,264.168** ML/Yr

#### NON-REVENUE WATER

**NON-REVENUE WATER:**  **35,874.325** ML/Yr

= Water Losses + Unbilled Metered + Unbilled Unmetered

#### SYSTEM DATA

Length of mains:  8  4,945.0 kilometers  
Number of active AND inactive service connections:  8  312,075  
Service connection density:   63 conn./km main

Are customer meters typically located at the curbstop or property line?  No

Average length of customer service line:  8  12.0 metres (length of service line, beyond the property boundary, that is the responsibility of the utility)

Average operating pressure:  8  50.8 metres (head)

#### COST DATA

Total annual cost of operating water system:  9  \$169,973,759 \$/Year  
Customer retail unit cost (applied to Apparent Losses):  9  \$2.35 \$/1000 litres  
Variable production cost (applied to Real Losses):  9  \$73.54 \$/Megalitre ☒ Use Customer Retail Unit Cost to value real losses

#### WATER AUDIT DATA VALIDITY SCORE:

**\*\*\* YOUR SCORE IS: 72 out of 100 \*\*\***

A weighted scale for the components of consumption and water loss is included in the calculation of the Water Audit Data Validity Score

#### PRIORITY AREAS FOR ATTENTION:

Based on the information provided, audit accuracy can be improved by addressing the following components:

1: Volume from own sources

2: Billed metered

3: Customer metering inaccuracies



## Example Audit 2b:

### AWWA Free Water Audit Software: System Attributes and Performance Indicators

WAS v5.0

American Water Works Association  
Copyright © 2014. All Rights Reserved

Water Audit Report for: **The City of Calgary**

Reporting Year: **2013** | **1/2013 - 12/2013**

\*\*\* YOUR WATER AUDIT DATA VALIDITY SCORE IS: 72 out of 100 \*\*\*

#### System Attributes:

Apparent Losses:	1,989.429	ML/Yr	
+	Real Losses:	32,274.739	ML/Yr
=	<b>Water Losses:</b>	<b>34,264.168</b>	ML/Yr

? Unavoidable Annual Real Losses (UARL): 8,015.57 ML/Yr

Annual cost of Apparent Losses: \$4,675,159

Annual cost of Real Losses: \$75,845,637 Valued at **Customer Retail Unit Cost**

[Return to Reporting Worksheet to change this assumption](#)

#### Performance Indicators:

**Financial:** { Non-revenue water as percent by volume of Water Supplied: 21.8%  
Non-revenue water as percent by cost of operating system: 49.6% Real Losses valued at Customer Retail Unit Cost

**Operational Efficiency:** { Apparent Losses per service connection per day: 17.47 litres/connection/day  
Real Losses per service connection per day: 283.34 litres/connection/day  
Real Losses per length of main per day\*: N/A  
Real Losses per service connection per day per meter (head) pressure: 5.58 litres/connection/day/m

From Above, Real Losses = Current Annual Real Losses (CARL): 32,274.74 ML/year

? Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI) [CARL/UARL]: 4.03

\* This performance indicator applies for systems with a low service connection density of less than 20 service connections/kilometre of pipeline



AWWA Water Audit Software Version 5.0 Developed by the Water Loss Control Committee of the American Water Works Association August, 2014

This software is intended to serve as a basic tool to compile a preliminary, or “top-down”, water audit. It is recommended that users also refer to the current edition of the AWWA M36 Publication, Water Audits and Loss Control Programs, for detailed guidance on compiling a comprehensive, or “bottom-up”, water audit using the same water audit methodology.

DEVELOPED BY: Andrew Chastain-Howley, PG\*, MCSM. Black & Veatch  
Will J. Jernigan, P.E. Cavanaugh & Associates, P.A.  
George Kunkel, P.E. Philadelphia Water Department  
Alain Lalonde, P.Eng. Master Meter Canada Inc.  
Ralph Y. McCord, P.E. Louisville Water Company  
David A. Sayers Delaware River Basin Commission  
Brian M. Skeens, P.E. CH2M HILL  
Reinhard Sturm Water Systems Optimization, Inc.  
John H. Van Arsdel M.E. Simpson Company, Inc.

REFERENCES: - Alegre, H., Hirner, W., Baptista, J. and Parena, R. Performance Indicators for Water Supply Services. IWA Publishing 'Manual of Best Practice' Series, 2000. ISBN 1 900222 272  
- Kunkel, G. et al, 2003. Water Loss Control Committee Report: Applying Worldwide Best Management Practices in Water Loss Control. Journal AWWA, 95:8:65  
- AWWA Water Audits and Loss Control Programs, M36 Publication, 3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, 2009  
- Service Connection Diagrams courtesy of Ronnie McKenzie, WRP Pty Ltd.



**VERSION HISTORY:**

Version:	Release Date:	Number of Worksheets:	Key Features and Developments
v1	2005/ 2006	5	The AWWA Water Audit Software was piloted in 2005 (v1.0 beta). The early versions (1.x) of the software restricted data entry to units of Million Gallons per year. For each entry into the audit, users identified whether the input was measured or estimated.
v2	2006	5	The most significant enhancement in v2 of the software was to allow the user to choose the volumetric units to be used in the audit, Million Gallons or Thousand Cubic Metres (megalitres) per year. Two financial performance indicators were added to provide feedback to the user on the cost of Real and Apparent losses.
v3	2007	7	In v3, the option to report volumetric units in acre-feet was added. Another new feature in v3 was the inclusion of default values for two water audit components (unbilled unmetered and unauthorized consumption). v3 also included two examples of completed audits in units of million gallons and Megalitres. Several checks were added into v3 to provide instant feedback to the user on common data entry problems, in order to help the user complete an accurate water audit.
v4 - v4.2	2010	10	v4 (and versions 4.x) of the software included a new approach to data grading. The simple "estimated" or "measured" approach was replaced with a more granular scale (typically 1-10) that reflected descriptions of utility practices and served to describe the confidence and accuracy of the input data. Each input value had a corresponding scale fully described in the Grading Matrix tab. The Grading Matrix also showed the actions required to move to a higher grading score. Grading descriptions were available on the Reporting Worksheet via a pop-up box next to each water audit input. A water audit data validity score is generated (max = 100) and priority areas for attention (to improve audit accuracy) are identified, once a user completes the required data grading. A service connection diagram was also added to help users understand the impact of customer service line configurations on water losses and how this information should be entered into the water audit software. An acknowledgements section was also added. Minor bug fixes resulted in the release of versions 4.1 and 4.2. A French language version was also made available for v4.2.
v5	2014	12	In v5, changes were made to the way Water Supplied information is entered into software, with each major component having a corresponding Master Meter Error Adjustment entry (and data grading requirement). This required changes to the data validity score calculation; v5 of the software uses a weighting system that is, in part, proportional to the volume of input components. The Grading Matrix was updated to reflect the new audit inputs and also to include clarifications and additions to the scale descriptions. The appearance of the software was updated in v5 to make the software more user-friendly and several new features were added to provide more feedback to the user. Notably, a dashboard tab has been added to provide more visual feedback on the water audit results and associated costs of Non-Revenue Water. A comments sheet was added to allow the user to track notes, comments and to cite sources used.

## How to Submit Your Level 1 Validated Water Audit to DWR

Congratulations on accomplishing your level 1 water audit validation this year! To achieve compliance with the Department of Water Resources's (DWR) Senate Bill 555 rules, **you must upload your level 1 validated water audit and certificate of level 1 validation by the following dates:**

- **October 1, 2020** if you have a Calendar Year 2019 audit
- **January 2, 2021** if you have a Fiscal Year 2019-2020 audit

To start the process, WSO will send you three files:

Document	Format	Action
Level 1 validated water audit	.xls	Submit to DWR
Certified validation report	.doc	Complete and submit to DWR
Level 1 validation notes	.pdf	Keep for your records

Once you've received these files, you must submit them on behalf of your utility.

### Step 1: Complete the certified validation report

The certified validation report documents that your level 1 validation was conducted by a certified validator according to Senate Bill 555 rules and allows you to communicate recent water audit and water loss control improvements to DWR.

WSO will fill out the first page of your certified validation report to capture the outcomes of level 1 validation.

You must fill out the second page of your certified validation report to narrate improvement steps and provide an executive signature. The narrative of improvement may be brief (a few sentences).

**Once you've filled out the certified validation report, be sure to save it as a .pdf file.**

### Level 1 Validation – Water Supplier Confirmation

This document confirms participation in and endorsement of the Level 1 Validation as completed.

*This acknowledgement is required for submission – alongside your Level 1 validated water audit software file – to the California Department of Water Resources.*

Water Supplier Name:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Water Supplier Public Water System ID:

Click or tap here to enter text.

*Enter your utility's identifying information.*

Water Audit Period:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Water Audit & Water Loss Improvement Steps

*Steps taken in the audit period timeframe to increase data source accuracy, reduce real losses, and/or reduce apparent losses, as informed by the water audit.*

Click or tap here to enter text.

*Discuss recent improvement actions.*

#### Certification Statement by Water Supplier Executive:

This water loss audit report meets the requirements of California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 7 and the California Water Code Section 10608.34 and has been prepared in accordance with the method adopted by the American Water Works Association, as contained in their manual, *Water Audits and Loss Control Programs, Manual M36, Fourth Edition* and in the Free Water Audit Software version 5.

Executive Name (print):

Click or tap here to enter text.

Executive Position:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Signature:

Click or tap here to enter text.

Date

Click or tap here to enter text.

*Fill out these four fields.*

## Step 2: Log in to the WUEdata upload portal

Access DWR's WUEdata upload portal through an internet browser at the address


[https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/secure/login\\_auth.asp](https://wuedata.water.ca.gov/secure/login_auth.asp).

Use the same log in credentials you used to submit your Urban Water Management Plan. If you encounter any difficulty, there are some help links below the sign in fields. Unfortunately, WSO doesn't have access to the WUEdata portal, so we may not be able to help you troubleshoot the log in process.



### Step 3: Access the validated water loss audit report tool.

Click the “Launch Water Audit Tool” button in the lower left in the WUEdata main menu.




Main Menu	
<b>DWR Population Tool</b>  DWR's Population Tool allows urban water suppliers to more accurately calculate their population using GIS and census data.  <a href="#">Launch Population Tool</a>	<b>Urban Water Management Tools</b>  The UWMP Tool allows urban water suppliers to electronically submit their Urban Water Management Plans (UWMPs) to DWR.  <a href="#">Launch UWMP Tool</a>
<b>Validated Water Loss Audit Report Tool</b>  The Validated Water Audit Report Tool allows water suppliers to electronically submit their AWWA v5 Worksheet and Certified Validation Report to DWR.  <a href="#">Launch Water Audit Tool</a>	<b>Agricultural Water Management Tools</b>  The AWMP Tools allow water suppliers to electronically submit Farm Gate Delivery data and Agricultural Water Management Plans (AWMPs) to DWR.  <a href="#">Launch AWMP Tools</a>

### Step 4: Search for your utility name to associate your submission with your utility

Use the Water Supplier Search field in the Add Water Supplier function to find your utility and associate it with your account. If you are already registered with the system as a result of your Urban Water Management Plan submittal, the platform should recognize your account and auto-populate your utility.

If you have not registered with the system before, it may take up to 24 hours for the system to confirm the association between your account and your utility before you can proceed with your upload. If you have questions, please get in touch with the WUEdata help desk.



**WUEdata - Water Audit Tool**

**WELCOME TO THE VALIDATED WATER LOSS AUDIT TOOL**

This tool is for the online submittal of validated water loss audits by urban retail water suppliers, as required by Section 10608 of the California Water Code. It is also allowed for use by wholesale water suppliers on a voluntary basis.

Use the search form below to link urban water suppliers to your WUEdata account.

**Water Supplier Search:** [\[Close Window\]](#)

Begin searching by entering a partial name - for example "Los Angeles". Enter more terms to narrow your search. Click the correct supplier in the search results.

If you are unable to find your Water Supplier, please contact the [WUEdata Help Desk](#).

[Search](#)

If you need assistance, please contact the [WUEdata Help Desk](#).

Launch the Water Audit Tool using the Agency Below:

Water Supplier Name
No are linked to your WUEdata account.

[Add Water Supplier](#)

## Step 5: Submit your level 1 validated water audit and certificate of validation

Upload two files:

- Level 1 validated water audit (version 2, after validation) in .xls format
- Certified validation report (completed with identifying information, narrative of improvement, and executive signature) in .pdf format

Upload Water Audit Report Files

Next

### VALIDATED WATER LOSS AUDIT SUBMITTAL INSTRUCTIONS

Online submittals of validated water loss audits by urban retail water suppliers are to be performed by loading two separate files, as required by Section 700.5 of the California Code of Regulations. Specifically, the two part report should include the following:

AWWA v5 Spreadsheet: An operating Excel spreadsheet with system-specific data entered into each field of the AWWA Free Water Audit Software version 5.0 worksheets, with a DVS.

Certified Validation Report: This component must include the following:

1. A statement confirming the Level 1 validation, including: the validation findings, the water audit validator's qualifications, and the date of the Level 1 validation review.
2. Information identifying steps to increase the validity of data and reduce the volume of apparent losses and real losses, as informed by the annual validated water audit.
3. The following Water Loss Audit Certification Statement, signed by the chief financial officer, the chief engineer or the general manager of an urban retail water supplier:  
  
"This water loss audit report meets the requirements of California Code of Regulations Title 23, Division 2, Chapter 7 and the California Water Code Section 10608.34 and has been prepared in accordance with the method adopted by the American Water Works Association, as contained in their manual, *Water Audits and Loss Control Programs, Manual M36, Fourth Edition* and in the Free Water Audit Software."

If you need assistance, please contact the [WUEdata Help Desk](#).

AWWA v5 Spreadsheet:

Certified Validation Report (PDF):

FILE PATH

Browse...

FILE PATH

Browse...

That's it! If you have any questions, please feel free to get in touch with us. If your questions pertain specifically to DWR's WUEdata portal functionality, we encourage you to get in touch with the WUEdata helpdesk using the links on the WUEdata portal.